A

DISCOVRSE

for Parents honour and Authoritie.

Written respectiuely to reclaime a young man that was a counterfeit IESVITE.

BY

His Father PETRVS ÆRODIVS, the renowned French CIVILIAN, *sometimes Iustice in causes Criminall*, and Master of Requests to the DVKE of ANIOVE.

Done into English at the instance of some worthy learned friends,

By IOHN BVDDEN Doctor of the Lawes, and his Maiesties Professor in the Vniuersitie of Oxford.

LONDON,
Printed by EDWARD GRIFFIN for *John Barnes*, dwelling in Hosier Lane neere Smithfield. 1616.

To the most Reuerend Father in God, TOBIE by diuine prouidence Archbishop of YORKE, Primate and Metropolitane of England, &c.

MOst reuerend good Lord, The late experience of some defections and reuolts in children of lewd behauior, which haue contemptuously prophaned all obedience to Parents; together with some desire of mine owne, to retaine the wauering dispositions of others, which may be in like ieopardie to be abused hereafter, haue put me into a busines would God so helpefull for them, as necessarie for the time, I meane this English translation, of a most excellent Latin Originall. It treateth for the honorable maintenance of Parents authoritie, and was compiled some fiue and

twenty yeares since by the famous French Ciuilian Petrus Ærodius, *in purpose to reclaime his sonne* Renatus, *who at that time, being vnder age, and without his fathers leaue had betaken himselfe to the Iesuites company. Doubtles, the good Parents griefe for an iniurie of such hainous qualitie, (if he may be heard speaking out of the tender bowells of his affection,) is euer within measure though it be excessiue, iust, though past hope of recouery. A sonne, nay the eldest son, the first fruits of his strength, so faire a bud, to be strip't from his natural barke perforce, and inoculated in a stocke of a strange kind, would abate the imputation of being censured passionate without a cause: euery man, to my thinking, vpon the supposall of such a person, being apt to acknowledge so much in himselfe, and that in the Poets phrase,*

Huic vni forsan, poterã succumbere culpæ.

The dignity of the discourse, needs no inlargment by a preface, for (if too much incredulitie ouer-weene not my iudgment) the most censorious Criticke, if he finde patience to pervse it in the native Edition, will in meere

iustice

iuſtice commend moſt, or allow all. The ſtile is cloſe wrought, and full of ſtuffe, the choice of his words apt and frugall, the ſentences deepe and ponderous, the ſhafts of his arguments, drawne by a ſtrong arme vp to the head, the nouelty of examples delightfull, the authorities venerable, yet infinitly various, his dealing faire and father-like, contending, rather for truth than conqueſt. Now might I take ſo much preſumption vpon me, as to hope of ſome degree of your Graces good acceptance, (to whom eſpecially, for diſcourſe, or title it is moſt properly belonging) I would farther alledge for my ſelfe, that I haue often ſeene my worthy predeceſſor M. Doctor Gentilis, *his Ma^tie^ Profeſſor for the Ciuil Lawes, reading me ſome Lectures, and teaching me how to offend in this kind, whom I euer found of this opinion, that his excellēt Lucubrations neuer proſpered better than when they receiued luſtre from your Graces iudicious confirmation: to whom, as he was very much obliged, ſo was he not ſparing rather by preuenting occaſion than by taking it, thankfully to report the ſame. And*

laſtly,

lastly, because the age wherein we liue, is so much visited with an Epidemiall distemper of disobedience, the cure will be sought for at their hands, who by reason of their eminent place of practise, best know (out of their great learning) to apply seuerall cures antidotes against such malignant qualities, and if that will not worke, then me thinks Lucius Brutus *his severitie well allated, would not come out of season, that deroba'd himself of all respect of a Father, that he might the better act the part of a Consull,* exuit Patrē vt Consulem ageret. *For such austeritie in Parents many times proues pitty, and is powerfull, to make obedience where it finds none. A reformation of so generall importance that euery man may be said to haue a part in it, though he can challenge no propertie, because* quod commune est meum est, *and (without peraduenture) an vndutifull sonne so reclaimed to his naturall obedience, is that* commune bonum.

Your Graces in all humble
seruice to be commanded,

IOHN BVDDEN.

The Author to the Reader.

HAuing for three whole yeeres together, made continuall enquirie after my eldeſt ſonne, and that to ſmall purpoſe, (for he is among the Ieſuits) I am now determined to preſent ſ to publike view, which I ſhould otherwiſe haue ſequeſtred to priuate vſe. I treat with him as with an offender, that contemptuouſly refuſeth to make his appearance; and as a man ſhould

ſhould do with a runaway, that is, by writ of outlarie, and proclamation of rebellion. Therefore I beſeech thee good Reader; if this expoſtulation & complaint of mine appeare vnto thee altogether cauſleſſe, and if it happilie ſo fall out, that thou meet with this poore youth, thus eſloined and ſeduced from me, be a meanes, that he may ſometimes peruſe this ſmal treatiſe: then if he find himſelfe reſolued, to be at his owne reines, & diſpoſing, I paſſe not, father or not father, whether he ſo take me or ſo refuſe me. From *Angiers* &c.

A DISCOVRSE for Parents honour, and *Authority ouer their* Children.

WHat is the reason that the famous Doctor *Gregory Nazianzene* in his oration Apologeticall which hee made to the people saith, that there is a great deale more in the authority apertaining to parents which is giuen thē from almighty God, than in that which hath bin established by men; either in their written lawes, or long continued customs? Is it so that this one commandement *Honour thy Father and thy Mother* commaunds more with children, than that hideous thunderclap of *disinheriting* them, inuented by the Grecians, or then the com-

miſſion of life and death, which though it be deteſtable in nature, yet was it our owne French law, and in vſe likewiſe with many other nations beſides; or then thoſe three ſolemne alienations, whereby children were freede from their parents ſubiection, and ſo many counterſales, which made them bond againe: deuiſes (as it is well knowne) of the Romane policy? Should the ſonne beene found diſobedient to his Father, by theſe lawes, the father did right himſelfe, and was both accuſer, witneſſe and iudge. Moreouer the execution of puniſhments, whereunto he might ſentence them, were of ſuch nature, as the very repreſentation of them to their memories (they were ſo bloudy & cruell) might preſently deterre from attempting or entertaining the leaſt breach of their bounden duety: but on Gods part, a bare commandement onely is ſufficient: be the childe dutifull, theres a reward for him; be he obſtinate, theres no puniſhment inflicted. And yet wee ſay, that lawes preuaile more when they bee penall, then when they ſimply doe but will and require, and that authority is more awful, which is properly our owne, and exerciſed in our owne name and right, then that forſooth which is indented with couenants, and taken vpon curteſie from an other.

Now

Now ſir, how wrought that ſame ſoueraigne fatherly authority, I meane that which iſſued from the prouiſion of man, and not from the ſacred conſtitution of God? why it wrought thus much, that this priuate diſcipline, did ſometimes farre exceede the publick, inſomuch, that wherein the Magiſtrates immediate authority ſeemed feeble and in a manner maymed, there the domeſtique diſcipline (being appealed vnto as to an higher iuriſdiction) gaue preſent help and aſſiſtance; that is to ſay, parents were able to doe more with their children, then law or legion, or Dictator himſelfe. *Cn. Martius Coriolanus* marched forth with a dangerous army, againſt his country, breathing forth nothing but ruine and vaſtation, whomade him to diſarme himſelf, forſake his enſignes, & leaue the commaund of the field but *Veturia* only: He that neither yeelded to Senators ſent vnto him, nor Magiſtrates, nor prieſts, yeelded to his mother. He that neither the Maieſty of the Empire, nor any touch of religion could cauſe once to retire, did ſoone relent at the name of his mother.

Cn. Seruilius, L. Sergius, M. Papirius, being Tribunes together, and in like authority, which was alſo Conſular, were vehement competitors, which of them ſhould be gene-

rall in the war againſt the *Lucani*: euery one was for himſelfe: and thereupon deſpiſed the charge of the City as an office altogether thankleſſe and baſe: the Senators beheld the contention with aſtoniſhment, Dictator was there none, that by ſtrong hand might order theſe factious Tribunes, ſaith *Q. Seruilius*, nay ſith there is no reſpect hereby carried to your owne ranke and quality, nor duty to the eſtate of this common wealth, my fathlery authority ſhal ſoone diſpatch this controuerſie. I tell you, my ſonne without drawing of any lots for the matter, ſhal bide at home, and gouerne the City. And what did the Father of *C. Flaminius* tribune of the common people, which enacted the law about the partage of ſome french grounds, by the poll, the Senate was againſt it, his colleagues mainly oppoſed him, which he ſet light by, an army was muſtred againſt him (in caſe he ſhould perſiſt in that opinion (but that danted him nothing, his father, euen as he was in the place to haue proclaimed his new made Law, ſeizes vpon him: how was it now with my yong maſter? downe comes he from his chaire of eſtate, and this braue gallant that before ſet at nought all the maieſty, authority and prerogatiue of his country, is now ſubdued at a poore priuate mans check, and as *M. Valerius*

ſtorieth

ſtorieth it in his fift booke, was not ſo much as once blamed for it, by the leaſt muttering of the ſeſſions ſo diſappointed and broken vp. How then is it poſſible, but that in the point of parents authority, there ſhould be more force in mans law than in the bare and ſimple precept as it was deliuered from God by *Moſes*, eſpecially if that be true which *Halicarnaſſus* reporteth that contempt, impiety, murdering of parents, were therefore ordinary monſters among the Greekes, but exceeding ſcarce and ſeldome to be found in Rome, becauſe the authority which thoſe ancient Law makers *Charondas Pittacus* and *Solon*, aſſigned to parents, was a mild and feeble regiment contrariwiſe that which *Romulus* gaue, was abſolute, full, and without limitation, whence it came to paſſe that in all the large territory of the Romane Empire, hardly will you meete with one *Malleolus* that is, ſuch a deſperate ruffian, as butchered his own mother?

What then may we ſay of this diuine commandement eſtabliſhed (as we ſee) neither by threat of abdication, nor loſſe of life? here is only commanded that which honeſty and good conſcience perſwades vnto. Nor let any man thinke that it is a good anſwer to the obiection to ſay that *Moſes* Law, aſwell as

any other law, did not only ſharply cenſure parricide, but euen euery diſhoneſt and idle ſpeech vttered by a ſonne, for we intreat not, what authority a publique magiſtrate hath, neither of a iudiciall proceeding held in conſiſtories, and common Aſſiſes, we talke of that which may be exerciſed at our home dwellings, in our owne priuate houſholds, which fathers, not officers, by vertue of their office, challenge ouer their children, that is to ſay without appeale to any higher bēch, without aſſiſtance of any other Iudges office? For ſo it is, he that puniſheth by the helpe of another, doth in deed not puniſh but complaine. But yet ouer and aboue al that which we haue already obiected againſt *S. Gregory*, it falls ſo ſhort that parents by this heauenly oracle haue any more dominion ouer their children, than either by theſe, or other humane lawes, that in truth they cannot be ſaid, to haue receiued thence any one iot of power or authority. For let a ſonne be negligent in performing of that one command, *honour thy father*, what may the father doe in ſuch a caſe? It is true, it allures him with reward, that is, with a proſperous and a long life, but it puts ouer no puniſhment into the fathers hands, no none at all. As though in ſo doing, ſomewhat would be found, which nature of her ſelf could

could not well abide. Did *Moſes* then miſtake, and when he deliuered Gods lawes was he ſomewhat more careleſſe in this point which concernes Fathers? A ſinne it is ſo to ſay; for this authority of parents, which wee ſeeke after, was for precedency of time farre more ancient than the commandement it ſelfe, which is demõſtratiuely, proued by this very inſtãce that God almighty, would neuer haue commanded *Abraham* to haue ſacrificed his ſonne *Iſaacke*, if hee had had no commiſſion of life and death ouer him. Would God haue enioyned it, would the father haue executed it, would neighbours and ſtrangers haue endured it, which in no caſe at no time, by no law a father might bee able to iuſtifie? beſides they that liued long before *Moſes*, would neuer haue buſied themſelus ſo much in matching of their children in wedlock: for that was a matter reſting in their choyce, not in the choice of the parties contracting mariage, which ſinne of theirs was cauſe of the vniuerſal deluge) nor wold the children bin ſo eager in purſuit of their parents bleſſing: and what ſhall we ſay more? ſurely the bare enditement brought in by the father to the Magiſtrate, would neuer haue ſerued for a ſufficient euidence againſt an vndutiful child, if euen in thoſe dayes, the power of a father

and his domestique discipline had not beene very transcendent. What shall wee say then? Did God by his latter law repeale the former and confine this duety to an inhibition of wordes alone? If the case were so, what then might wee say for *Nazianzene*? Without doubt something might bee spoken for him, and very much, were it not, that the very selfe same Christian Religion, which in a manner we receiued from him, did in some sort now crosse the good Christian Bishops assertion. For this authority of parents (if there be any such thing extant) is so far reuolted from that which was ordained and established by God, by nature, by the Law of nations, and Law positiue, and that forsooth vpon no other occasion (but that wee (I cannot tell how) seuer this filiall duetie from religion) that among Christians now a dayes to be a Father, is nothing else but so to bee tearmed, the duetie is gone though the name continue. Can Christian religion then, and Gods heauenlie commandement, wich Saint *Gregory* so highly commendeth, maintaine the home discipline, if Christians bee the men which especially ouerthrow it? But before we passe any further in the discourse, let vs satisfie this great Diuine, and then consider, whether it be true, that now a daies there is any authority

left

left vs ouer our children or no, and if it bee any, and yet but of verie ſmall eſteeme, whether notwithſtanding it bee ſuch, or ſo much, as ſhould be expoſed to all contempt and wrong. Certaine it is, that the outragious cruelty which the ancient Lawmakers deuiſed to improue the power of parents withall, was but a caſt of policy, that ſo in regard thereof, either out of pure conſtraint, or of a ready mind, children might conforme themſelues to better behauiour, and at no hand bee withdrawne from that reuerent obeyſance, which naturall affection (and no law nor ordinance of man) taught them, as they were ſucking of their mothers breaſts. They in their wiſedom knew right well, that youth was ſo prone to riot and luſt, ſo arrogant and laſciuious in behauiour, ſo hard to bee tamed and menaged, that they concluded it to bee a caſe of meere neceſſity by way of enacting ſuch terrible puniſhments, to renue and repaire that, which was ſo far corrupted and depraued from natures primitiue inſtitution; that as in old time they kept debters to their word by tearing their limbs in ſunder, & drawing bloud from them, & the like, ſo the very ſhew and repreſentation of ſuch horrible tortures and martyrdomes which parents might inflict vpon their children, might leſſon them obedience

dience and beare them downe, if they ſhould euer attempt or vndertake any thing that paſt not firſt by their allowance and leaue, by whom they liued, & had their education: but yet thereby no checke was giuen to naturall affection, for it was to be intended that although parents might be ſo tender of their childrens good as to enter into ſuch ſeuere termes of conſultation for them, yet the law-makers neuer dreamed it would once ſo happen, which they permitted: that is, that a ſon might be ſold by the father for a bond-ſlaue, diſinherited, and then kild. Or if perchance it might ſo fall out, that it ſhould be vpon ſuch as had worthily deſerued it, and with ſuch circumſtantiall conſiderations, that iuſtice her ſelfe, ſhould ſhe haue giuen iudgement could neither haue ſaid better, or done more vprightly. But God almighty handles matters otherwiſe, that which he commands is plainly ſet down, not with fetches and deuices. For hee needs no compaſſing or prefacing to perſwade that to be iuſt and good which he once requires, he is ſo eſſentially good of himſelfe, and hath ſuch a prerogatiue of iuſtice and equity cõſubſtantiall to him as his bare command neceſſarily enforceth our preciſe obedience. Religion keeps men more in aw, than feare: for were the ſon

looſe

looſe or diſhoneſt, of conuerſation, and for that cauſe oftentimes turnd out of doores, nay laſtly refuſed of the parents for their child, becauſe no gentle meanes preuailed ought with him? Why if once he were conuerted to chriſtianity preſently (ſaith *Septimius*) he became to liue in good order, and good counſell regaind him to duty and obedience. Doubtleſſe though God vnto theſe lawes of men and nature inſerted alſo his heauenly beheſt, yet did he nothing thereby preiudice thoſe former lawes; he commanded obedience, but neuer abrogated any part of their authority. Nay long time after Chriſts paſſion, the commiſſion of life and death which parents might exerciſe vpon their children, was ſtill currant amongſt Chriſtians, and though the more ancient of them reproued ſome things amongſt the Pagans, as the murdering of yong infants, the bloudy fencing of ſword players, yet againſt that terrible authority of parents they ſpake not a word. And howſoeuer God in bare termes pronounced this Commandement, *honour thy father and thy mother*, yet notwithſtanding for two reaſons eſpeciallie it farre exceeds the lawes of men. The one is, becauſe what he commands is conſtant and perpetuall, but our lawes bee mutable and repealeable: if any

anything pleaſe vs to day, to morrow we are out of loue with it: a patterne whereof wee may ſee in that verie lawe which *Romulus* ordained. For at firſt without all exception or bar, it was free for a father to put his child to death. Afterwards it might not bee done but vpon the aſſiſtance and aduice of others, then the cauſe muſt bee heard iudiciallie: laſtlie the magiſtrate might decide it, but no priuate iuriſdiction, nay in concluſion that rigorous lawe, vtterlie vaniſhed and became voide: the other is, becauſe if the iniunction of a Conſull bee greater, than the Pretors and the Pretors greater than an order of the Edilis, it will neceſſarilie follow, in good proportion, that the lawe of God is to bee preferred before any ordinance of man whatſoeuer. And why ſo? becauſe men in their wiſedomes may erre, and therupon be of meane reputation by reaſon of ſuch eſcapes & ouerſights, as ſaith the ſame *Tertullian*. In God there is no ſuch matter; ſo then *S. Gregory* who vnderſtood this well enough, and was of opinion that this precept of our Lord God ſhould be left at large, and neuer concluded by any limitation, (when he had forſaken the world, againſt the will and expreſſe commandement of his father, and had betaken himſelfe to a monaſtery,

and

and had refuſed a Biſhopricke which before was his fathers, yet at length he began to be toucht with a ſence of inward regreeting: and can I (ſaith he) be vndutifull and diſobedient vnto ſo good a father, and be blameles; can I endure to be accuſed for a ſtubborne and contemptuous ſonne, to be guilty of violating and diſtaining my natural obedience vnto my father? and thereupon leauing the ſolitary life, he gets him home, accepts the ſea and Biſhopricke which had been before his fathers: and all this doe I (ſaith he) more for God almighties commandement ſake, than for any feare of mortall men: therefore now good father, I pray giue me your bleſſing. And in this ſence (you ſee) may *S. Gregory* be well vnderſtood. For euen *S. Chryſoſtome* in his eleuenth booke againſt ſuch as diſcommend the monaſticall life, writes in this manner: Thy ſon loues and obſerues, and honors thee, not becauſe the law of nature enioynes him ſo to doe, but much more for that in ſo doing hee may teſtifie his duetie to the commandements of almighty God, for whoſe loue he hath perfitly deſpiſed and relinquiſht all the world. But if notwithſtanding all this, it be true, that now a dayes there be no trace left of this fatherly power which we ſo much hunt after, and if this home bred

authoritie

authority be ſcarce remaining in ſhadow or ſhew among vs, how may *S. Gregory* be then defended? the power of life and death long ſince hath bin diſcontinued by an immemoriall cuſtome to the contrary (as before we mentioned) you cannot pawne or ſell your ſonne, much adoe you will haue to diſinherit him. If he get any thing it is for himſelfe, his father hath no part nor property in it, hee will ſ rue his father with proceſſe, he will endite him at the common Aſſize without asking him any leaue. And in a word ſuch is the religion now adaies, ſuch is the Churches tradition (as men ſay) that let the ſonne entet into any kind of life, bee married, bee a monke, or ſo forth, all this may he doe in ſpight of his fathers teeth, and abſolutely againſt his will. How then (good father *Nazianzene*) or wherein ſtands that ſanction ſo much inforced by God and nature, *honor thy father*. What didſt thou ſee in that authority royall, and preheminence of parents when thou vpon a timorous ſcrupuloſitie of conſcience durſt not once ſo much as to treſpaſſe againſt it. If in the caſes before mentioned our children may diſobey their parents, and yet not be punſhed by them, put mee ſome caſes out of the old law, why they ſhold not now enioy the like libertie? or what be the

the principall points of this domeſtique monarchie, which the chriſtian religion, doth yet retaine and defend for lawfull? can it bee poſſible, that heathen parents haue puniſhed euen to the pit of hell a ſhameleſſe and vngratious ſonne (ſo far were they in louewith the childrens obedience) it is a matter ſpoken of that father which (as *Pauſanius* relateth it in his tenth booke) *Polignotus* drew in a picture of hell taking paines to bee his owne ſonnes hangman for a ſpeciall prancke of vndutifulneſſe, that he had plaid him in his life time: And haue chriſtians on the contrary inuented caſes, to authoriſe vnnaturall impietie and breach of duty againſt parents? can it be poſſible (as ſaith *Theophilus* in his third booke to *Eutol.*) that *Platoes* law for the communitie of wiues, was principallie vpon that point diſliked, becauſe the danger might be, that the ſonne might ſomtime honor him that was not his father, and vpon ignorance at another time might alſo doe him no reuerence, who was his father indeed, (a reuerence neuertheleſſe ſo due by the rules of the lawe of nations, and in ſuch order marſhalled by them, that (as *Pomponius* teſtifieth) it is to be ranged in the ſecond place, firſt God, after him our parents, and then our country) and ſhould we vnder colour of religion

ligion in that one point principallie offend? First and foremost, therefore we will speake thus much in generall (as men do vse to sell wares in grosse) that the position and assertion is very sottish and impious, because the gouernment of parents, is weakned and rebated in some points, and circled within an order, that, *Ergo* there is no such matter at all remaining, because the preheminence of parents is abrogated, (to speake in the Romane dialect) *ergo* it must follow there is no duty no naturall reuerence at all left vnto them. Then descending to particular dueties, wee will take a view, whether euery one of them bee so important, as that of pure necessitie parents ought to bee obeied in speciall or no? Which will be soone found if we take some farther view, and make a quire, what that was which the ancients did so exactly require of their children when they past ouer such a large iurisdiction and power vnto the parents, the case is cleere, that they did it not therefore, that parents should bee as magistrates to their children, and so administer iustice at home to euery one that their children had offended, againe as the Prætor did in the Court of the common pleas, nor that there should be one authority publique, another priuate and domesticque. For if the crime

crime were publicke, and committed without the verge of the fathers house, the officer was to order it. Nor is it a good conclusion, the child hath offended, therefore he must haue no other iudge but his father. Indeed it is true that there were such fathers in times past at *Rome*, and likewise amongst other nations (whereof we haue written in the sixt book of our reports, the seuenth Chapter) that by vertue of such fatherly authoritie, wold take cognisance of such crimes as their children had offended in abroad; as *Cassius*, *Manlius Torquatus*, *C. Flaminius* and some others besides,) so then this was no occasion, that gaue such a prerogatiue to the power of parents, but that rather which *Halicarnasseus* in the life of *Romulus* alleadgeth, that when children did perceiue, how they were awed at home, and that their subiection vnder their priuate parents, was much more strict than vnder the publique Magistrate, (for they are commanded first to yeeld obedience to their parents, after that to their country) that the Prince himselfe might scarce doe any thing without iudiciall proceeding. But the father might do euery thing at his own will & pleasure (for so speaks *Aristotle* in his politiques) they might learne to be more dutifull, to doe nothing without line and leuell,

that is, without expreſſe commandement and iniunction from their parents, might neither will, nor nil ought, ſaue that which proceeded firſt from their parents pleaſure and by his allowance. In a word, that as the bit, ſpur, and ſwitch, makes the horſe obedient to his rider, ſo the feare of ſo great chaſtiſements might enforce the ſonnes conformity to his father, as to a demie God on earth, and ſole founder of his being. And ſurely, had our forefathers meant no other thing hereby then to put a ſnaffle into youthes mouth, to reſtraine them from ſuch vices as nature is prone vnto, why then they would haue determined this their authoritie, at ſome certaine time or age of the ſonne, vpon ſome certaine office or honour, that might haue befallen, or ſome condition and eſtate of life whereunto they might poſſiblie be aduanced. But the ſonne, were he neuer ſo old, bare he neuer ſo great office, yea had it been the high Prieſthood, was euer notwithſtanding vnder his fathers checke. And what thinke you was the iſſue thereof? marry ſir, whatſoeuer the father had once determined concerning his children, to what kind of life ſoeuer he had bound them, yea and though it had been to the cart and plough, as *L. Manlius* did vſe his ſonne, why by reaſon of ſo eminent a power, againſt which

which there was no helpe, no remedie to be had, he muſt of neceſſity reſt content. Hence it was that all the ſonnes negotiations had ſuch dependance on the fathers will, as you ſee counterpaines haue, that muſt accord with their originalls, or riuers haue, that muſt be fed from their fountaines head. And though (put caſe) the ſonne ſwaruing ſome deale from this courſe of duty, as being ſtubborne and paſt all ſhame, found his penalty thereupon executed, ſometime with more rigour, ſometimes with more clemency, though the father by the ordinances of ſome countries might ſentence his ſonne to death, by others complaine of him to the magiſtrate, and only giue in euidence againſt him, nay though by long preſcription theſe domeſtique cenſures haue been altogether diſuſed. For to ſmall purpoſe is their inſtance, and (God knowes it is a poore one) that alleadge why but yong children be ſtill yet vnder their parents correction: it will be no good inference to conclude that therefore it is not now any longer iuſt and reaſonable becauſe law had once determined it to be ſo; it will be no good inference to conclude, that the law and edict of all nations, which decrees an abſolute obedience to parents, is now clearely vaniſhed and out of vſe. Lawes be lawes ſtill, though

they be not penall, though there be no loſſe of life nor forfeiture of goods enſuing: as for example, adultery though there be ſmal adoe made about it, now adaies, yet in its owne nature, it is alwaies foule and diſhoneſt. If either by negligence or coniuencie it be not ſharply puniſhed, the law notwithſtanding is ſtil chaſt and honorable which forbids it. And ſo the law for childrens obedience, is euer right & conuenient, though many times no penaltie enſue This is euident ſpecially out of Moſes. it is true, he would not that a father ſhould put his child to death with his owne hands, but rather ſeeke for it by petition from the magiſtrate, and ſo haue it executed, and that alſo without any other enqueſt, or euidence, than at the fathers ſuit: from whence it is more then probably collected, that in the common wealth of the Iewes the father had a ſoueraigne authority, in caſes of life and death, for although by this order of *Moſes*, it were ſomewhat ſtaid from ſpeedy execution, yet the matter is plaine, that it is eaſier for me to bee a petitioner that another man ſhould be executed and die, than that I ſhould be his executioner with mine owne hands. But howſoeuer, I would faine know and learn, why and for what offence a father might endite his ſonne, by this Hebrew Law-makers decree,

decree, that vpon ſuch conuiction he might be preſently ſtoned to death. Was it becauſe he was a murtherer a Church robber, a traitor, a theef, a fornicator, or an vſual offendor againſt the peace of the King, his crown and dignity? Let vs heare his owne words deliuered to this purpoſe:

If any man haue a ſonne that is ſtubborne and diſobedient, which will not harken to the voice of his father, nor the voice of his mother, and they haue chaſtiſed him and he would not obey them.

Then ſhall his father and his mother take him, and bring him out vnto the Elders of his Citie, and vnto the gate of the place where hee dwelleth:

And ſhall ſay vnto the Elders of his City, this our ſonne is ſtubborne and diſobedient, and he will not obey our admonition, he is a robber, and a drunkard.

Then all the men of the Citie ſhall ſtone him with ſtones vnto death.

I pray what manner of offences be there herein mentioned? be they not treſpaſſes againſt parents, priuate miſdemeanours and domeſticall, hatcht within doores, not acted in publique view? certainly as by order of military diſcipline contempt in a ſouldier is a crime very capitall, becauſe there is nothing ſo far endangers the ſtate of an army, as one

mutinouſly diſpoſed, ſo by the ſame correſpondencie of reaſon, it is fit and requiſite that all perſons belonging to my charge, as my ſeruants, my children, my wife, my cattell, all ſhould be at my becke, all ſhould be vnder my conduct as the chiefe generall, all ſhould be actuated by my motion, as hauing ſurrendred the intereſt of their liberty into my plenary diſpoſition and authority. *Ælianus* tells vs a ſtory of one *Rhacp Mardus*, who hauing brought his ſonne *Cartomes* like a priſoner with his armes faſt pinacled into the preſence of King *Artaxerxes* to receiue iudgement of death, vpon ſuggeſtion that he was a graceleſſe deſperate caſtaway, and grew to be very earneſt to that point, why (ſaith the King of *Perſia*) canſt thou endure to behold thy ſonnes life taken from him? his anſwer was, I haue in my garden a lettice rudely ouergrowne with leaues, and though they be lims of the bodie, yet doe I now and then crop off and prune ſome of the bitter ſtalkes, and ſuch as may be ſpared: What doth my lettice thinke you die for griefe vpon the matter, or doth it mourne, becauſe there is a limbe or two lopt off? nay, it flouriſheth the better and ſuch a maim makes him eat a great deale the ſweeter. In like manner may it pleaſe (you O King) to deeme of me, for albeit I

ſhall

ſhall ſee and behold the death of this wretched varlot that hurts and anoies my houſehold, corrupts, by his ſtubborne and lewde example his poore yong brethren, I will neuertheleſſe be ſtill of the opinion to ſpeed the better by it, yea and rather thriue by ſuch a maim than any waies be endamaged by it, and this is ſutable to that of *Meſs* and *Halicarnaſſeus*. But that I may the better proue this point, how is it that this queſtion, namelie whether a ſonne, in ſome caſe may lawfullie diſobey his father, firſt ſtepping aſide out of priuate mens houſes, entred into the publique ſchooles of the vniuerſitie, to bee diſputed and queſtioned there, and after to be decided finallie at the ſeat of iudgement, but that it was neuer in mans memorie heard of before, nay the contrarie was euer held for certaine and true, that ſuch a queſtion would neuer haue been propounded? when *Danaus* much againſt his will, had matcht his fiftie daughters to *Egiſthus* his grandchildren, and had charged the yong virgins that on the mariage day euerie one ſhould murther hir husband with ſuch a ſword, as to that end he had giuen them, (the iuſt like tale may you read in *Chalcõdilas*, of a Phyſition of *Florence* that commanded his daughter to poiſon *Lantiſlaus* King of *Naples* the firſt night they

they should lie together) euerie one did as their father had enioined them excepting only *Hypermnestra* which saued her husband *Lynceus* his life. But what followed hereupon? these murderous paricides were so far from being brought, to answer the law and plead not guiltie for the matter, or that their obedience herein was deemed culpable, that contrariwise *Hypermnestra*, for that she had not performed hir fathers behest, was thereupon publiquelie arraigned, and much adoe to be freed at the common Assises, so that in point of obedience vnto parents no exception wold be taken, to haue denied them or to haue doubled with them had vtterlie been vnlawfull. The truth is, freed she was, but the verdict was brought in vpon euen voices, with such demurring, and so much hazard of life, (the record is famously knowne by her owne letter in *Ouid*) that as though she had escaped some dangerous shipwracke, she built a Temple vnto *Venus* and *Diana*, and hung vp a table in memoriall of her deliuerie. How then should that domestique dutie be blemisht or broken, when children though they had offended in obeying their obedience notwithstanding, was vnto them their chiefest commendation, their refusall a crime vtterlie vnpardonable. That great Oracle of the Law

Vlpian

Vlpian holds this opinion, that he may not properlie be ſaid, to haue any will of his owne that liues vnder commaund of a father or maſter, and well worthie is he of pardon (as he thinkes) in this caſe, that pretends neceſſarie obedience for his excuſe. And queſtionleſſe *Tiberius* was of the ſame mind, that a ſonne might by no meanes refuſe the command of his father. But howſoeuer, it hath been alwaies held (ſaith *Gellius*) be the thing honeſt which is commanded, or be it indifferent, the obedience thereunto ought to bee abſolute. Be it diſhoneſt and againſt good manners, yet the care muſt be neuertheleſſe ſuch ſo not to obey, as that it bee done with a modeſt and lowly behauiour, notwithſtanding a vaine of tart reprehenſion, or refuſall, or the leaſt ſhew of diſlike. Reſpite the doing of it for a time or put it off handſomelie, rather than refuſe to doe it, let there appeare a maidenlie baſhfulneſſe in a conſtant deniall, and let the ſonne diſcouer ſome zeale that he would fain obey his father, when he obeieth him not. As *Ageſilaus* did, who when his father charged him that he ſhould giue a ſentence againſt law, marry father ſaith he I well remember, that long ſince you willed me to be euer for the law, I will therefore at this time not doe that which you command me now, but that

L. 11. F. de iis qui notantur infamia.

which

which was your pleaſure I ſhould haue done long agoe. And as *Acrotatus* did, of whom when his parents required ſome thing vniuſtlie hee denied it honeſtlie in this manner: I know you would haue me to doe that which is honeſt and iuſt, for ſo you bred me vp (I thanke you) I will therefore doe that which you once willed me to do, but that which you now command, I may not. He that ſhould openlie gainſay and arrogantlie oppoſe himſelfe againſt his father, ſhould proue no better than a malepert wicked vngratious impe. Euen in a good cauſe, a ſonnes ſpeech towards his parents ſhould be humble and reuerent, (as *Saluianus* ſaith) for how elſe ſhould that be true, which our forefathers were wont prouerbiallie to ſpeake, a man may wrong his dutie, by the caſt of his countenance, if by any law in the world a ſonnes diſobedience were maintainable. Should the perſon of an Embaſſador be ſacred, and inuiolable, among enemies, and muſt you ſpare to vſe the leaſt word of diſgrace againſt him? and would you haue the maſter of a familie entertaine, and harbour within his owne walls, vnder the roofe of his owne houſe, one authorized to be his comptroller, his checkmate, nay his profeſt mortall enemie? but why beſtow we ſo much time, and proofe about

about this position? forsooth to this end, to make good the deuise and plot of this domestique authoritie, that in case children should obiect or pretend ought against it, all passages of contradicting or questioning might hereby be preuented: for it is an obligation wherein wee are bound to nature, and the condition is that we be euer subiect to our parents It is holie and acceptable, not only before God, but euen amongst men, that children should be obedient vnto their parents in singlenesse of heart and without all malice, as saith *Theophilus* to *Eutolicus*. And whereas almighty God added nothing besides the bare and simple commandement to threaten the offendor, he did it vpon this reason, that he thought it sufficient for him briefly to comprize that, which otherwise was naturall among all men and notoriously knowne in their conscience well enough to be a true, vnchangeable, & perpetuall notion. To the intent therefore, that we may shew that this authoritie of parents streams foorth from natures spring, tell me, is there any reason to be giuen, that a woman should be more in subiection to a man than a child is to his parents? why; but a woman in respect of the sole infirm tie of her sex is subiect to a man, and there is no other reason but the sonne

owes

owes him double seruice, the one in respect of disparitie of yeers, between them, the other in respect of his fathers goodnes towards him. But grant there be no fee of duetie to bee acknowledged: for the first, which is ods of age, and when once they come to strength and full yeares, in Gods name cancell that obligation; (and yet *Aristotle* will tell you, that such prerogatiues of aduantage can neuer be determined) I would faine know of what sort you take this last to bee, I meane a parents bounty, and whether that may expire by any age or time: tis a doctrine of naturall reason, that wee are bound to requite them which haue beene good vntovs: for in this point none can be of a contrarie opinion to *Vlpian*, (and as it is fairely deliuered by *Philo*;) the vnthankefull man sinnes against humanity, if according to the meanes of his abilitie, he requite not kindlie a benefite receiued; nay, not to returne one good turne for another, in the sense of Saint *Ambrose*, is little better than wilfull murther. Well then, but there is no greater obligation, thē that which is due from children to their parents, after God they be our Gods; that wee are, that wee liue, and moue, tis the bounteous gift of our deare parents, and such a gift as may admit no manner of recompence, for it can neuer bee possi-

poſſible, that the ſonne ſhould beget his Father: now concerning the mothers tender care and diligence, what thinke you of the ſweet food wherewith ſhee nurſes her poore infant? what thinke you of thoſe pretty louelie iniuries which the innocent Babe manie times doth to his mother? as ſoone as hee is thirſtie, the mothers dugge is ready to giue him drinke; and before they breede teeth, they meete that with their lippes, which needes no chewing; as he ſpeakes, that is the ſuppoſed author of Saint *Ieromes* epiſtle, *De honorandis parentibus*, *for the honouring of parents*; and he addes moreouer, that for this cauſe parents ought to bee dearely eſteemed of their children, becauſe they can neuer bee repaired by any other; for when once the law of all fleſh hath taken them out of this world, a man ſhall neuer bee able to finde another father or mother; then what a diueliſh ingratitude were it (as that other *Plato* ſaith right well;) If we for great matters cannot finde in our hearts to beſtow ſmall trifles? for manie benefites a few poore retributions? whatſoeuer to the vttermoſt of our power wee ſhould render to them of what value were it; what ſcale would it beare being compared with this light which wee ſee, this educatiō which we haue, this Country which

we

we enioy, this natiue Country wherein wee liue, thoſe large poſſeſſions from Fathers and Grandfathers, lineally diſcended vpon vs, which muſt maintaine vs & ours: for al theſe we are tenants in fee, and holde them from our parents donation. (Let *Seneca* ſpeake his pleaſure to the contrarie, he ſpeakes but like a diſputer;) but what ſaith the great Doctor *Origen*, who when hee ſpeakes well, no man ſpeakes better: hee in his eleuenth Homily vpon *Leuiticus*, writes in this wiſe: The name of a father is a great miſterie, the name of a mother is a concealed reuerence, God is thy ſpirituall father, and heauenly Ieruſalem is thy mother. Firſt, God thy father that created thy ſoule, and therehence it is ſaid, I haue begotten ſonnes and exalted them; ſecondly, thy bodilie father, is thy father, by whoſe meanes thou waſt borne and begotten in the fleſh, and cameſt into this world, that bare thee in his loines. Now then, becauſe the name of a father is ſo ſacred and venerable, therefore whoſoeuer ſhall curſe his father, ſhall die the death. In like ſort muſt wee imagine of our mothers alſo, by whoſe labour & care we were borne, and bred vp, wherefore as the Apoſtle ſaith, thou oughteſt to be reciprocally thankefull to thy parents, for if thou diſhonour thy carnall father, his contempt

tempt reflecteth vpon thy ſpirituall father, and if thou iniurie thy mother, that iniury redoundeth to the heauenly Ieruſalem, therfore at no hand muſt wee be at variance, or conteſtation with our parents, no not ſo much as in word. He is thy father, ſhe is thy mother, let them in Gods name doe and ſaie as they pleaſe, they know well enough what is fitting to be done. As for vs be we neuer ſo obſequious and dutifull to them, yet ſhall we come ſhort, of that full meaſure of thankfulneſſe, which we owe them, for our birth, for our bearing, for the fruition of this glorious ſweet light which we behold, for our food, and laſtly for the courſe of inſtitution (perhapsas it may ſo fall out) in ſome of thoſe learned and liberall ſciences, nay oftentimes they be the cauſe, that wee come to the knowledge of God, that we frequent his Church and heare the word of his heauenly law. Now if this inſtinct which proceeds from God and nature, and this kind retaliation of benefits be found euen in ſenceleſſe and bruit beaſts, then ſhould man, whom the graces haue foſtered, to whom curteſie and good manners is hereditarie, be worſe than a lion, a Storke, a parde? for of the piety of Storkes and Swallowes, *S. Ambroſe* ſpeakes excellentlie in his fift booke of the *Examcron*

the

the sixteenth and seuentéenth Chapters, and if so be (as *Epictetus* will haue it) that nature is not ouer curious, of what qualitie or condition thy father be, be he good or bad, base or honorable, he is still thy father, the obligation which thou entrest into by being his sonne can neuer become voide. Can then any doubt be made, whether his will and commandement be in all cases to be fulfilled? the verie person of parents and patrons should be alwaies religiously honored, and obserued of the sonne and the freed man, as *Vlpian* the father of the Law hath adiudged it. But put case that the sonne should obiect that, which *Diogenes* sometimes did obiect to *Zeno*. That children were nothing beholding to their parents for their begetting, because that proceeded rather from a passion of pleasure and sence than from any sound loue or good affection. He that imploies himselfe about the begetting of children lest of all intends that which he goes about, he heeds not procreation, but the satisfying of his owne appetite and voluptuous desire. Indeed this were well spoken for a Cynicke, and well said to turne away the imputation from bruite beasts and put it vpon men; yet euen verie beasts when by course of nature and season of the yeere, they couple together for breed, do it more to

reare

feare their yong than for any rage of ſenſuall appetite; (as *Athenagoras* thinks) Well, if there were no ods betweene their copulation and our mariages, if matrimonie proceeded wholly from the law of nature, taught in generall to all liuing creatures, not from the law of nations peculiar onlie to men of reaſon: or that now it were no longer held for a matter of high miſterie amongſt vs chriſtians, but of ſhame and diſhonor: not a league of loue to liue together in the eſtate of holy wedlocke, but ſome partnerſhip, or conſpiracie rather to the ſatisfying of brutiſh luſt, and carnalitie. But ſuch mens iudgements concerning mariage, comes either from ignorance, as not knowing what it meanes, or from ſome tedious diſcontent, which they find in liuing ſingle. But *Socrates* in *Zenophon* hath giuen *Diogenes* his anſwer in this point to the full. For (ſaith he) why ſhould men marrie, if children were begotten to ſatisfie ſenſuality: cannot the fire of luſt be quenched except ye firſt muſt needs marrie? but now, in that we are content to vndertake the yoke of mariage, (which I muſt needs ſay lies heauy vpon ſome of vs) we do it to multiplie the world by propagation of children. For were it otherwiſe, we would neuer be ſo curious about the matter, I warrant you, to enquire of what age

ſhe was whom we meant to marrie, of what houſe ſhe came, what good conditions ſhe had, we would neuer bee ſo carefull, for the education of our children borne vnder that mariage, giue them ſuch meanes for their inſtitution, take ſo much deliberation for their matching afterwards, if luſt and pleaſure had been our onelie ends and reſpects. Far more diuine was that conceit of *Philo* in a dialogue of his concerning mariage, who expreſſeth himſelfe thus, Parents when they beget children, be deputie officers, and vicegerents vnder God, both ſerue and be ſubordinate for procreation, the one frames the body, the other workes the ſoule: and therefore *Ignatius* writing to the *Philadelphians* tearmeth parents fellow labourers with God, in which ſenſe man is the liuelie image, and counterfeit of God, as *Clemens Alexandrinus* reporteth in his eleuenth booke of Inſtitutions. Therefore neglect one, neglect both: condemne the vnderworkman, and ſet at nought the maſter workman himſelfe. Nay ſaith *Philo*, they be not workmen, they be euen Gods amongſt vs, and when they beget their children, they repreſent one God, that is from all eternitie not begotten. The difference is, God is the creator vniuerſall, man the indiuiduall, God of all creatures, man of his children onlie

ly: whereupon it followeth in his opinion neceſſarilie, that he muſt needs be impious, againſt the inuiſible, and incomprehenſible God, that is careleſſe in performing all good offices, and duties to theſe inferior Gods our parents, that liue amongſt vs, be euer in our eie, and in our familiar acquaintance. The very ſame witneſſeth *S. Iohn* in his firſt epiſtle and fourth Chapter, *If any man ſay, I loue God, and hate his brother, hee is a lier, for how can hee that loueth not his brother, whom he hath ſeene, loue God whom hee hath not ſeene?* for loue God and the ſparkes of loue will be kindled towards your neighbour: loue your neighbour and then your loue to God ward will be in a burning fire, as *Gregory* the great ſpeaketh in the ſeuenth of his Moralls, the tenth Chapter. Nay beſides all this, *Moſes* that gaue lawes to the Iewes, in deliuering his holy ordinances, marſhalleth the honour due vnto God in the firſt table, but repeating afterwards in *Leuiticus* the verie ſame precepts, he begins with the honor due vnto parents, requiring vs to yeeld them honor and obedience: afterwards in a ſecond place he commands the ſame for God, as who ſhould ſay, they be both Gods alike and the definitions are but one in ſence and ſignification, he that honors his father and

mother, honours God, and he that honours God, by an infallible consequence, honoreth his parents also. Most certaine it is, that when *Zenocrates* the Philosopher, wrote that the Athenians kept most religiously in their Temple of *Eleusis*, three fundamentall precepts, whereunto their vse was to reduce all such lawes as euer *Trepsolemus* had made for them: the first begins with parents, (as *S. Ierome* testifieth writing against *Iouinian*) saying honour thy parents, worship thy God, abstain from flesh meat. And that most diuine *Plato*, who may truly be stiled another *Moses*, after that he had written many things concerning God, why saith he, these be no lawes, but the preambles and prefaces to such lawes, as we intend to make for the honor of parents. Marke, how he that sayes the father must be worshipped deduceth his premisses from God himselfe. What an holy speech was this in comparison of that of *Teleucer*, who though he knew the nature of this dutie well enough, being on a time demanded why the yong men of *Lacedemon* rose vp, and gaue place to their ancients, made this answer, that being trained vp so in ciuilitie towards strangers, they might be more apt to honour their parents also? *Tertullian* in his booke of praier, is verily of the opinion that the name of a father

ther is a name of reuerence and authority, and which should attempt to take away dutie from children, or gouernment from parents, vpon partialitie leane more to the one than the other, he in so doing, should take away both, and rob parents of that preheminence which the Lawes of God, nature, and men haue euer inuested them with. So then if we must still continue this dutie towards our parents, euer be heedful to obserue and keep it, why may wee not conclude the same for parents authoritie ouer vs in this manner. Children must alwaies honor their parents, *ergo* parents must euer cómand their children. These sweete louing affections were both iointlie worshipt in one oratorie by the old Romans, and in my fancie should not now bee sequestred from being mutuallie dependant one to the other. For my better proofe herein, I would pray leaue a little to examine an argument of *Tertullians*, and to consider the necessity of his illation wherby he will demonstrate Christ to be God, yet not God the father, but God the sonne. I am not come saith Christ to do mine owne will, but the fathers that sent me, this did he euer fulfill euen to his death. Hereupon he infers the conclusion *ergo* he was not the father but the sonne. Now sir, how could this argument follow if the sonnes will should be

distinct or any other, thā the fathers wil? what maiestie or honor were there added vnto God, in calling him a father (wee haue no name elsewhereby to know or expresse him) it there were no proper or naturall signification for the name to this purpose? if there were no more difference betwixt parents & children, but a nominall distinction, and the diuersitie to rest onlie in name, but no title of authoritie or iurisdiction? but now a daies where can you find anie other difference? for fathers at this time to emancipate or enfranchize their children, is held not necessarie. If my sonne could speake as soone as he were borne, I thinke this would be his language, Sir I acknowledge you thus far foorth for my father, as to giue me maintenance and bring me vp. I came a free man into the world and if I liue but one twelue or fourteene yeers to an end, I hope to sue out my liuerie for my wardship. If I can but keepe my hands from doing violence to your person, I am sure though in other matters I proue respectiue or vndutifull, no man will much complaine of me. The power and authoritie of you parents is cleane reuersed, and abrogated. Now should you threaten him with some curse or reuenge that would follow vpon this contempt, this answer would be, tis a long while ere that comes, Sir, and I shall loose nothing by the forbea-

forbearance. But if ſo be this thorow perſwaſion did ſinke into mens hearts, that he that offended his father offended God, that to be excluded from the fathers preſence, were aboue all other puniſhments the chiefeſt, in briefe, if the ſonne could be made to to vnderſtand how dreadfull the bitter curſe of a father were (whereof we may chance to ſpeake ſomewhat more at large hereafter,) why theſe might be ſufficient props to defend and keepe vp, this excellent fabrique of rule and authoritie which in theſe daies is ſo much ruinated and decaied. But now (ſuch is our corruption) all this will not ſerue the turne, that ancient ſeueritie of the Romanes would better preuaile with them, that is, they ſhould neuer be brought to anie iudiciall trial for the matter, but be condemned and neuer heard ſpeake, which is a courſe of proceeding that *Halicarneſſens* and *Quintilian* oftentimes mention. And why? becauſe a commonwealth is nothing elſe but a bodie incorporate of ſo many priuate families, and ſo founded & begun by parents, that as (me thinks the reſemblance were not much vnfit) to terme a family the nurſe, the wombe, and the roote of a common wealth: contrariwiſe a common wealth, a ſwarme, or colonie deduced from a priuate familie. He therefore that will gouerne

uerne a common wealth in good fashion, and banish al loose & dissolute behauiour thence and all crimes and exorbitant offences, let him looke first to good order at home. If he can make them lowlie, sober, and dutifull within doores, they will come into the world, so nurtered, so taught, so affected, well may they change their homes, they will be sure neuer to leaue their old manners. Contrariwise, let him looke carelesslie to it, let him but once suffer the reines to be at libertie, presentlie shall you see treasons, murders, rapes, adulteries, gush out in large swelling streames, and surround the countrrie: and this is the cause (if I be not mistaken) why in ancient time they appropriated to priuate families peculiar gods, taking it for good policie, to countenance the infirmitie of domesticall iurisdiction, with the authoritie of diuine religion, that both these two like mighty cable ankors, might hold them in all tempests fast to their obedience. That euen as the tender infant, ledde and guided by the little finger, is able afterwards of himselfe to walke without a guide; so comming to mans estate, the meanes of this priuate education, might awe and order him in the Common wealth, to carrie a due respect to the Magistrate, but not to dread his person, as hauing

the

the ſword borne before him to graee his office withall, not to terrifie well-doers. But verily in mine opinion there can bee nothing more abſurd or incongruous, than once to thinke that Religion is any way aſſiſtant to this good order; for (if it be true, which before I toucht) certes Chriſtian Religion as it is vſed, doth more ſuppreſſe and pul down, than either eſtabliſh or ſet vp this authority of parents: and there is nothing ſo much withdrawes our children from duetie and obedience as thoſe two precepts of the firſt and ſecond Table, which now a daies men make meere contradictories, Honour God, and honour thy parents. Its a maruellous matter, that whereas euer heretofore theſe two commandements, held good correſpondency with each other, and might both be fulfilled together, they ſhould now bee tearmed oppoſite, and ſo repugnant one to the other, that hee which fulfilles the one, muſt of neceſſity breake the other. But whence come theſe ſtrange & newfound problemes? Marry Sir I will tell you, euen from the diſputes of our ancient Philoſophers that wrãgled about this queſtion, whether at all times, and in all matters, we ought to obey our Fathers commandements? for as there haue been ſome that handled this queſtion iuſt as *Bias* did the

the question of sacriledge; there is no body, saith *Bias*, that is sacrilegious, for if some God or other be resiant in euery place of the world, then doth a thiefe conuey nothing out of one hallowed place, which hee carrieth not into some other hallowed place; so haue some of our Philosophers vsed the like subtlety in treating the matter of this power of parents. There is no necessity (say they) why you should obey your parents: for either they command that which is iust, and we must doe it, not because they commaund it, but because it is iust; or els they commaund that which is vnlawfull, and vve may not doe it, not because they commaund it, but because it is vnlavvfull. Whereupon the conclusion followves, *ergo* there is no obedience due to them at all; yea but *Gellius* replies, the Dilemme is not perfect, for that some things are of a nevvter and indifferent nature, vvherein vve must obey them absolutelie, and some things are in their ovvn nature good and honest which vve are the more bound to do, because they commaund them. Some distinguish otherwise; in some cases wee must obey, in others wee may not. For, what if my father should commaund mee to plot treason against my Country, to murther my mother, to kill my Prince, or facts of the like detestable and imi-

impious nature. Right ſo, whileſt the Schoole Diuines began to argue, whether one might ſerue God and man, or whether God were to bee ſerued before father (as though there were any queſtion to be made of it, but God muſt, without all exception bee obeide, when the matter commaunded tends to impietie) they fell fowle vppon the ſame tenents, with the Philoſophers, which were verie vncertaine, idle, and blaſphemous. In good ſouth, I hate not the perſon of any man that makes difference betwixt honeſt and vnhoneſt, lawfull and vnlawfull, nor yet them neither, which make ſome things neuter and indifferent. The opinion in ſome ſort is to bee excuſed: but without doubt, the ſafer way had been, neuer to haue ſtirred in the matter, that is, if they had not reuolted from thoſe mens iudgements, which helde the queſtion affirmatiuelie, and without diſtinction, that parents in all things were to be obeide. For ſay it be true, which by a cauilling diſtinction they haue put vpon vs, yet to my thinking they haue no ſound footing to ſtand vpon for it: and to ſpeake my opinion, the determination of ſuch queſtions is exceeding dangerous. How much more cautelous and circumſpect then was *Philo*, writing vpon the decalogue, when treating of the two firſt commandements,

mandements of the two Tables, he saith (as his manner is to doe all things) most diuinelie: they that leauing all other affaires of the world, bestow themselues wholly vpon contemplation, or they that abandoning all deuotion, apply themselues to action wholie to obserue their parents disposition, conforming themselues respectiuelie to liuein the world, as though they would bee taken apart, either for Gods seruants in the one, or mens friends and followers in the other: I tell you these mens vertues are but perfect by the halfes: nay, he that offends against either partie offends against both. Doubtlesse some such matters there be which will neuer bee drawne to anie manner of mediocritie or indifferencie, but presentlie they doe some harme or other: for doe but shake them a little, & they stagger presentlie; bring them to the touch, you will finde they cannot endure the triall. These diminitiue questions be like fine cates, for as the more dainetie and delicate they be, do sooner putrifie and corrupt in the stomacke. so these if they be too much minsed and refined, they mar the generall tenant which is defended of all men. Whether the Bishop of Rome be aboue or vnder a generall Councell, whether the Emperor be aboue the people, whether democracie be better then monar

monarchie, whether in religion contrarietie of ſects may be tollerated, at firſt ſight, they be ſet forth with a maruellous faire ſhow, but if you marke them well, there is poiſon ſerued in, when you come to the reckoning. For vpon theſe and ſuch other like diſputes, euerie day enſue, ſchiſmes, ſeditions, ciuill wars, & this queſtiō now in handling, is much after the ſame ſort. For he that once made but a doubt whether the dutie and reſpect which we owe to our parents were to binde vs for terme of life, (and not rather of *Turnus* his opinion maintained againſt *Tarquinius*, that there was no ſuch ſummary proceeding, as when father and ſon were parties, where the iſſue was ſoone tried, if he be vndutifull, fare him wel, and al ill luck go with him. For make but the leaſt breach into the fort of naturall dutie, ye ſhall preſentlie ſee how he falls to railing, and reuiling, to ſtabbing, nay to murthering of it. And ſo hauing begun with his father, he is like enough to finiſh it with inſurrection againſt his Prince. This then was euer a maine determination, amongſt the ancient philoſophers, that obedience in all things was preciſely to be yeelded vnto, when our parēts required it. Or put caſe, any inconuenience ſhould happen thereupon, better were it to admit the propoſition, in termes of largeſt

largeſt extent, than out of any priuate or particular caſe to argue againſt a common and receiued opinion, and to determine it accordinglie, either in ſchooles, conſiſtories, or pulpits. And this doth *Cicero* wiſely obſerue in his booke of offices, yee ſhall not find anie ſuch queſtion in all his booke: he was euer reſolute and confident vpon the point, that children muſt not be their parents maſter, nor ſubiects their Princes, nor ſchollers their teachers, nor ſeruants their Lords: not, but that ſometimes they far ſurpaſſe them for wit and pregnant diſcourſe, but that it cannot be auoided but that iniuries and contempts will be offered, when ſuch compariſon and oppoſition of perſons is once endured. Let authoritie be once diſgraced, and farewell authority. When in a great ſeſſion of the *Centumuiri* holden at *Rome*, *Accia Variola*, went about to diſproue the will of her father, which ſomtimes had borne the office of a Pretor there, for that he had bequeathed vnreaſonable legacies to her ſtepmother, there came to the hearing of the cauſe, ſo many fathers together with their children, vpon a feare and expectation of which ſide the fathers or the daughters, the ſentence ſhould paſſe, that the Iudges (as *Plinie* reports) like wiſe men left the matter as they found it. For no other occaſion than

than this, leaſt peraduenture if iudgement had been giuen for the daughter, other children by her example might in time preſume to conteſt with their parents. But to come neerer to the matter, in theſe like queſtions, I would faine learne whom we ſhould follow, prophane Philoſophers, or the bleſſed Apoſtle Saint *Paul* who in his Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, aduiceth thus, *Children obey your parents in all things, for this is pleaſing with God*, where when he expreſly ſetteth downe *in all things*, hath he not vtterly excluded, thoſe two parts of the diſtinction, *In ſome things you muſt obey, in ſome things you may chuſe whether you will obey or no?* and the concluſion withall, *we be not bound to obey?* nay but why did God the father of all parents, forbid *Adam* to eate of the fruit of the tree in the midſt of the garden, but that he would trie whether *Adam* would obey him in all things or no, as ſaith *Theophilus* to *Eutol?* nor is the obiection worth the ſtanding vpon: why but what if the father ſhould command any treaſonable practiſe or attempt againſt the eſtate? becauſe here is a caſe put which neuer happens at the hundreds end, or ſo ſeldome, that it would be paſt ouer in ſilence, and neuer more lookt after. Nay contrarie wiſe, (as I ſhould thinke) the preſumption is ſtrong and holds

For

for the father, what manner a man soeuer he be; good or bad that he will neuer command his sonne, that which he in his conscience knowes to be fowle and dishonest. Yea let the mother be neuer so lasciuiously giuen, yet will she traine vp her daughter in chaste and vertuous demeanour. Moreouer, he that argues this act of a fathers command makes that a reason for his allegation, which is mainly against all reason, that is, he supposes old men doting fooles, and yong men graue counsellors: he makes the sonne iudge whether the fathers actions be lawfull or against law, good in their owne nature, or by his construction and surmise. And all this can neuer agree to discretion, and honesty. For so he sowes matter of question and debate, where indeed the only vertue should be (the vertue so highly esteemed of the noble Lacedemonians) to yeeld obedience and that readilie. But because error is growne potent, and hath giuen such a deepe wound as the scarre will hardlie be couered ouer, let vs a little by the way consider what were those neuter and indifferent things which *Gellius* speaketh of? to my remembrance they be these, as if (saith he) thy father bid thee to be a souldier, to till his land, to be an officer, to be an aduocate, to marrie a wife, to goe vpon his errand, come when

when thou art ſent for, and ſuch like, which in themſelues be neither good nor bad, but as the intent is and manner of doing them, ſo may they merit blame or commendation. For if the father ſhould charge me to marry a wife that were infamous, paſt all ſhame, or diſparagious for any enormious crime, if he would haue me plead *Catiline* or *Bibulus*, or *Clodius* his cauſe, then were his commãdement herein not indifferent becauſe here is a troupe of diſhoneſty one vpon the necke of another. So that if his pleaſure were to enioin me ſuch actions, the queſtion were at an end; how far forth I ſhould obey him: were it not that the thing which *Gellius* plainly pronounceth for indifferent, as to marrie a wife, to enter into this or that kind of life, now adaies are taught to be of ſuch nature, that conſent & authoritie of father is nothing thought of or reſpected in them: my ſonne may marrie, may be a Church man, may be a monke, not onlie without my leaue, but ſpight of my teeth though I doe expreſly forbid him, and that which all Vniuerſities, all Conſiſtories, all opinions, of learned men, without any interruption or impediment haue euer permitted in fauour of naturall dutie, that doe theſe men, vnder pretence of faith and religion, vtterlie reuerſe and diſanull. But out eniewing

diſcourſe ſhall ſpecially lie in this place be confined within the compaſſe of religious vowes, wherin I muſt haue leaue to tell thee, that either thou art in fault that without any priuity or conſent of mine betookeſt thy ſelfe thus to the Ieſuits order, or I am to be blamed that notwithſtanding holy Church affoords thee ſuch a libertie, grieue and take on for the ſame For as concerning the argument of mariage & the freedom thereof, whether parents haue any voice in their childrens beſtowing, our countriman *Paquerius* hath written ſo learnedlie thereof in his Epiſtles, as who ſhould but offer to adde one line, to that which he hath written of that ſubiect, might rather preiudice his owne iudgement, than any way the picture drawne by the pencill of ſo curious a workman. I muſt needs confeſſe that the determination of the Biſhops aſſembled in the Councell of Trent makes much for my contryman his purpoſe, that although clandeſtine contracts, made without the parents aduiſe and leaue) ſtand for good mariage till the Church diſalow them, yet neuertheleſſe for many weighty and important conſiderations, the Church thought it beſt altogether to interdict and diſauow them. It ſeems ſhe would haue a reſeruation in her ſelfe to determine the controuerſie, and not permit

mit it ouer to the arbitrement of parents, whether ſuch mariages were good and according to lawe, or contrarily void and of none effect. I muſt likewiſe grant that ſundry conſtitutions enacted heretofore by many of our chriſtian Princes in their Diets and Parliaments, are pregnant for his purpoſe, namely that ſuch matches are no better than a rape and no mariage at all, or if it be, they take order to vndoe the mariage knot with the point of an imperiall ſword. Yet for all that which *Paquerius* hath written about the queſtion, I would pray leaue to adde two notable precedents, not with that ſelfe conceipt or arrogancie, as though I meant to confirme or confute ought about the cõtract of maiarge, which either the Church or our moſt illuſtrious Princes haue beene pleaſed hitherto in their excellent wiſedomes to determine, but that our children might hereby know and be well inſtructed, that all that is according to lawe, is not therefore by and by according to honeſtie, leaſt perhaps that contempt and neglect which now they meaſure vnto vs, be afterwards by a iuſt ſentence of reuenge written in heauen, meaſured by their children vnto them alſo. The one example is of *Rebecca*, and the woman of *Timnath*, both which although God had

appointed the one for *Sampson*, and the other for *Isaacke*, yet it pleased him notwithstanding that these marriages should first be made by the aduise and liking of their parents, that *Rebecca* should be demanded of *Bathuel*, of the mother, and of the Vnckle, yet so, as *Abraham* the father must giue charge about the message, and not the sonne *Isaacke*, *thou shalt be discharged from my oath, saith Abraham to his* seruant, *if thou goe vnto my country and to my kinsfolke, and they shal not giue her vnto thee.* The Angell of the Lord made way to these mariages, but their parents contracted them; The other example is of *Tertullian* in a treatise written to his wife: Oh how shall I be able (saith he) worthily to describe and set foorth the blessed estate of that couple, whom the Church hath ioined together, praier and thanksgiuing haue confirmed, angels in heauen proclaimed, and the father in earth approued, for euen here in the world children may not marrie without their parents consent and approbation, either in respect of due solemnitie or force of law. Doubtlesse his meaning hereby was, that mariage among Christians had better successe and prosperity when first it was approued by almighty God, as hauing in this world the consent of parents

rents, and in that other the consent of our father which is in heauen. The same opinion was maintained by *Soterus* liuing vnder the raign of the Emperor *Commodus*, as also auerred by *Euaristus* and S. *Ambrose*. Proceed we then in Gods name and let vs now discourse of religious vowes, not questioning their validitie, nor the perfection of the religious or lay life, which of them both is better nor any such matters. But whether children be at their owne libertie and pleasure to conceiue and make solemne profession of a vow, if the father be not acquainted first with it, or else if he disclaime it; as also whether without him a sonne may enter into the Ecclesiastical vocation, and the father must not present him before he be admitted to holy orders. Hereof I say we will presume to entreat so far foorth as a meane Ciuilian may haue good leaue, either to know or take in hand, such secret misteries of your profession. And if the whole faculty of Diuines, or those seducers of yours, haue any thing else in store, to giue me satisfaction in my question, let me vnderstand of it as soone as may be possible, that so for mine owne part I may set downe, and rest contented by their resolution. But for you sir, I would haue you to lurke no longer in corners, but make your personall ap-

pearance to the summons, and be not afraid boldly to chant that high sentence of *S. Ierome*, against them, which in a depraued sence they haue perhaps trumpt in thy way: *Cruelty in such a case is your only piety.*

First then let it be considered how paynim people obserued their vows. For though they were far wide of the true worship of God, yet in their religion, they left out nothing which might any waie make, either for the honor, maintenance, or enlargement of it, nay it were hard to say, whether therein they surpassed not vs Christians. True it is, that these paynims were not very scrupulous to offer either themselues or their goods to Idolls, nor was it very materiall with them why and wherefore they made such rash vowes. Neuertheless, this was euer a disputable question among them, whether the vow were of any validity, without the fathers consent and authoritie. Most certaine it is that in the matter of sacrificing the children the parents were to offer them to the sacrifice, the case is cleare out of *Tertullian* in his *Apologeticus*, whereas saith he, *Saturne* neuer vsed to spare either his owne children or other mens, but indifferently deuoured both; thereupon such as were parents offered their sonnes and daughters to be his sacrifices, and willingly exposed them

to

to him, nay they would fawne and flatter the poore innocents, to the intent, that they ſhold not howl & crie, when they were to be ſacrificed which you may likewiſe read in *Plutarch* in his booke which he entitles *Of Superſtition*, towards the end: but ſay, there were no parents liuing to giue vp their childrē to this diueliſh abomination? what was to be done in ſuch a caſe? Its well inough knowne, that the Prieſt had no ſuch power or authoritie, to take whom he pleaſde for the ſacrifice. This was a ſpeciall prerogatiue reſerued for the Magiſtrate (and more then this came to) hee choſe out the virgin by lot, which was appointed to be ſacrificed, that ſo the Gods might ſeem to beat their own choice for the oblation, and not at the Prieſts deuotion, and on whomſoeuer the lot fell, ſhee was to be offered; as you may reade in *Homer* of *Iphigenia Agamemnons* daughter, in *Pauſanias*, of *Lycicus* and *Ariſtodemus* their daughters, in *Plutarch* of *Smintheus his daughter*, whom the Dolphins ſafely ſet a ſhore, with her ſweet heart *Enalus*. Hence come thoſe themes vſuall & frequent in declamations. A virgin ſacrificed to the peſtilence. A ſonne that is diſinherited, to bee offered for ſacrifice. A ſiſter liuing infamouſly to be ſacrificed. Which ſort of Rhetoricall exerciſe, partly you may read in *Quintilian*,

(an.

(an Author by me first restored to his integritie) partlie in *Calphurnius*, for whome the learned *Pithous* did as much; but in all these and the like, it would be noted, that should the sonne or daughter voluntarily offer themselues, their parents are euer opposed as meet and able persons in law to except against the. For no man would haue admitted such a bar (I promise you) I thinke scarce among boyes in the Schoole, if children might haue beene permitted to sacrifice themselues. And hence it commeth (as you may reade it in *Philostratus*) that *Meneceus Creons* sonne, vpon an answere of *Tiresias* the Prophet, sacrificed him selfe without his fathers priuitie, which otherwise meant to hinder him from such a purpose. But most memorable is that which is written by *Plutarch* in his booke of *Superstition*, that if a man had not any children of his owne, the fashion was to buy them of some poore people: but in that case, it might not serue the turne to haue him present, and consenting, that made sale of his childe, it was besides requisite that the naturall mother, should come forth, eyther to testifie her willingnesse, that her sonne should die in that manner, or to forbid the sacrifice. *Virgil* in the eleuenth of his *Æneidos* glanceth at such like sacrifices, when he brings in *Metabus*, drenching

ching of his daughter *Camilla* in the riuer *Amasenus*, and thus beſpeaking:

(Diana,
Faire Queen of the ſpringing woods, chaſt Lady
Here to thy ſeruice I do vow Camilla my daugh-
(ter.

Vpon which place, *Seruius* his note is good. Twas well ſaid, *the father himſelfe vowed her*: for that none but fathers had their children vnderſuch bonds of *obedience*. And *Plutarch* in his booke of *Iſis and Oſiris*, talkes to *Cleà* the Nunne, in a Phraſe of the like ſtraine: *Euen ſince thou waſt a childe, thy parents dedicated thee to the ſeruice of the Goddeſſe Oſiris*. And thus much in briefe for the Grecians.

Now to come to our Anceſtors, among the *Gawles* (as it is yet with vs) there were three eſtates and orders among them: the *Druides* were the men of moſt principall marke and eſteeme, and were ſo highly reputed of, and had ſuch large priuiledges, by reaſon of their ſacred Miniſteries, and their interpretations of doubtfull queſtions in religion, that well was hee that could bee of their company, to be enrowled and profeſt in their rule. What? but might children ſo doe without their parents liking? No forſooth, as you may well vnderſtand by *Cæſar* his owne relation, ſome (ſaith he) be allured with great rewards, ſome

out

out of a voluntarie disposition enfrock themselues into the Religion; some their parents send thither, and some their kinsfolke. Such were Voluntaries, as were at their owne disposing, such as were sent thither, liued vnder awe and charge of parents or guardian. The Romanes haue a title in their booke of Digests, *De Pollicitationibus*, *of Promises*, in them there is special mention made of such promises, as either we make solemnely to God, or to our Countrie: but if a sonne liuing in subiection to his Father, should make any such promise, it were nothing worth, and this, *Vlpian* out of his learning deliuers vnto vs for law. Men that be Masters of families after they come to bee of full age, are bound by their vowe and solemne promise: but as for a son during his minormity, or a bondslaue whilst he is a villain, neither of them can bind themselues by their vowe without the fathers or Lords authority. Indeed he that is a master of a family after the death of the auncestor, must necessarilie be of full age, to make his vowe good, but let the sonne be neuer so old, and make a vow, be it not ratified first by the fathers approbation, it is vterlie voide and of no effect in lawe: and the case is the same, though he haue a stocke of monie or anie patrimonie of his owne, to imploy and occupie

pie for his preferment: the vow notwithſtanding al this is of no force or obligatiõ in law. And what may the reaſon hereof be? becauſe he that is not his owne man, can neither come in bond himſelfe, nor ſtatute out anie thing that he hath. Moreouer he that hath right and intereſt to any thing, cannot looſe it but by ſome fact of his owne. And therefore a ſonne liuing in ſubiection vnder his father, howbeit he might be termed to doe a godlie and religious act by vowing and promiſing that which is none of his owne, yet were the act (though to neuer ſo religious vſe) no better than plaine theft and pillage: firſt in vowing his patrimonie, and ſubſtance, becauſe the father hath a propertie in it, then in vowing his perſon which is a matter in deed of greater conſequence, becauſe he is no free man to this intent, abſolutelie to diſpoſe of himſelfe: and the parents by ſuch a conſecration ſhould wrongfully be depriued of the heire of the houſe, the hope of their linage, and the propagation both of their name and familie, and laſtlie of all ſuch goods and chattels, which being purchaſed by the child, were after him, to reuert vnto the fathers poſſeſſion, ſo that for iuſtifying of the ſonnes vowe, the conſent and allowance of the father was eſſentiallie neceſſarie. Very fauourable is that inter-

interpretation which makes for religion, (we doubt not) yet withall not to be rackt to so high a straine, as thereby to neglect all due and laudable solemnities, for that were the next way rather to prophane religion, than to aduance it. Our father and our country haue each one as much authoritie as the other (let that be grãted) yet (as *Liuy* storieth it) when *P. Cornelius Scipio* was Pretor in *Spaine*, and had vpon the great ieopardie of a battell, promised solemne plaies and shewes, after the victorie was obtained, made afterwards suit to the Senate for some alotment of monie out of the treasurie to that vse, their answer was, that his vowe bound not the Senate of *Rome* and therefore he should make plaies and shewes in Gods name, at his owne charge, and vpon his owne purse, or with such spoiles and booties as he had taken in the war. Now may a sonne doe that with his fathers goods, and that without asking him any leaue, which the greatest officer in *Rome* could not doe without the Senates warrant? if you tell me, that the vestall virgins might bestow themselues against their fathers will, because they were said *to bee taken, not to bee chosen*, and that therefore the high Priest, did not receiue them as presented by their parents, but *tooke* them away perforce; such kind of reasoning,

from

from the nature of the word, will ſtand them in ſmall ſtead: for this ſolemnitie or phraſe of ſpeech which the Biſhop vſed, *I take thee Amy*, is ſo far from implying, that there was any vnwillingneſſe or violence in the action, that it makes moſt eſpecially for that purpoſe which we maintaine. Surely there was no *taking* without ſome *giuing*, and in this ſence the high prieſt, *tooke her* that was dedicated to *Veſta*, but by your leaue ſhe was firſt giuen and preſented by her father. Whence *Metabus* in *Virgil* infers, *Take here thy ſeruant Goddeſſe chaſt.* but *Gellius* cleares the point in his firſt booke: therefore it ſeemes to be ſaid, that the maiden is *taken* becauſe (ſaith he) the high Prieſt *taking* her by the hand, lead her away as a captiue from her father vnder whoſe obedience ſhe liued: and ſome few words before that, hauing recited the ancient ſolemnitie of the Papian law, which enacted *choice and lot* as fitteſt meanes to be vſed in the admiſſion of any perſon vnto religion. At this time, ſaith he, if any man of credit or worſhip, come to the high Prieſt, and offer his daughter to be a Nunne, the profeſſion is as lawful, as if all the ceremonies had been performed, which the Papian law requires. And it was a matter of ſuch neceſſity, that the daughter ſhould be offered by the parents, that if ſhe were an orphan

phan, fatherlesse and motherlesse. she was reputed vneligible for that religion. The same may be said, if either she her selfe were emancipated, and set at libertie by her father, and in the life time of the father, became subiect to the power of her grandfather, she was to be refused and put by, as a person vneligible: and why so, might not her grandfather present her? might not her guardian? might not her ouerseer? if she were at her owne disposing, might she not vowe and offer vp her selfe? *Labeo Antistius* wil tel you she might not, because a girle vnder six, or aboue ten could not be receiued into the order. Why but might not any other present her? no, there was none so fit, and without all exception for the purpose, *as her owne father*. If any else had done it, there must haue beene some ordinary hearing and debating of the matter, but had the father done it, it was thought needlesse and vnnecessary. For as when a naturall father, will adopt his naturall and base borne child, to be his lawfull sonne, the adoption wil hold vpon anie termes, so it is in point of consecration, let but the father tender his child to religion, and there is nothing else expected For what if the daughter, vpon som dislike or other would leaue *Vestaes* cloister, and lay it to her grandfather or gardians charge,

charge, that they had no ſuch authoritie or commiſſion, to make her change her eſtate and manner of liuing, that this power belongs only to him that hath power of her life and death, that is, her father, as *Seneca* tels me? For the grandfather had nothing to doe with it: ſurelie he that makes a poore yong girle enter into an order of religion, that liued before in the world at large, doth in manner execute her aliue, and make her a baniſht woman in her owne country: and therefore not without good cauſe, the *father* alone was put in truſt with this high authority. For as for the chiefe Prieſts authoritie & vſurped right, were it not firſt giuen & take by the fathers leaue and permiſſion, it was iudged to all intents and purpoſes clearelie voide in lawe. Now ſhould it be vrged, why but this which you ſpeake of, was of vſe onelie in veſtall Nunnes, and that principallie by reaſon of their minoritie, when they were profeſſed Nunnes, this obiection is eaſily anſwered and the contrarie opinion clearely euicted by *Gellius* his owne words which be theſe, *Manie be of opinion that onlie virgins ſhould bee taken after this faſhion, to orders of religion, nay but euen* Iupiters *Prieſts, the Biſhoppes, the ſoothſaiers, were to bee taken and admitted in the ſelfe ſame faſhion.* And certaine it is, that male children in their

their parents life time, were so taken. Doe we not read in *Dion*, that when the great controuersie was about *Cornelius Spinter* his admission into the Chapter of the high Priests, though *Faustus* were both his kinsman and an high Priest, likewise in the Colledge, that the naturall and adoptiue fathers did both ioine in this, to make good their presentation for their sonne and not the sonne for himselfe? question lesse it is, that children could not exempt themselues from filiall obedience, had not the father first allowed them the libertie, which needed neuer to haue been granted them, if they might haue made vows at their owne pleasure, and without their fathers consent. But that I may come by little and little to times of christianitie, (for perchance these heathenish examples, can doe little good with you) I pray you, as you think, what lawe or custome had the Iewes for their precedent in this case? first, it is not said anie where in expresse tearmes to the sonne, Leaue father and mother, but with this prouisoe, that he should cleaue to his wife. If any thing be otherwise spoken it is by way of aduice, and may not passe vpon trust without stricter examination, as it shall else where be declared more at large. In deed in case of mariage there is an absolute commandement penned, without

out all limitation, to renounce all naturall affection and dutie, but in other caſes it is done with ſo many cautels and deliberations, that in my iudgement it were better ſtill to keepe on the high rode way, than to iourney by coaſting. But whatſoeuer it be, that *Adam* in that place ſpeakes of the relinquiſhment of our parents, doth the argument thereupon conclude, that the knot of wedlocke, is of more force and power then the bond of filiall dutie? nay verily, for this proceeds and ſprings from nature, and (which is more) from our owne indiuiduall and perſonall ſubſiſtence: that other, from a deſire to propagate a mutuall ſocietie and conuerſation amongſt men. And whereas, a man and his wife be accounted as it were for one perſon, this is in the intent and imagination of the law, and therefore we ſee them eaſily to be parted againe, as *Anaſtaſius* ſpeaketh in the tenth booke of his commentaries vpon the *Hexameron*. But the ſonne is altogether bone of our bone, and fleſh of our fleſh, he is one and the ſelfe ſame perſon with his father, a parcell of the ſelfe ſame ſubſtance, and (as I may ſo ſay) a verie piece carued out of his body and ſoule: whence it followes, that come what can come, a ſonne muſt euer be a ſonne: Diſinherit him, turne him into the wide world to ſhift

for himſelfe, ſell him, leaue him to his owne libertie, ſuffer him to be adopted into another family, ſtill nature holds her owne, bloud and kindred will neuer be altered. Before the Emperor *Conſtantines* daies, had the father vnnaturally forſaken and caſt off his daughter, yet might ſhe not marry an husband without his conſent But a man might be rid of his wife (God he knows) many wais: by the ſentēce of a Iudge in Court, by madneſſe (ſuch a law the Emperor *Leo* made) by a ſeparation from bed and boord, by bondage and laſtly by diuorce: but in children the caſe is admirable: that, though the principall obligation be extinguiſhed, (as ſay I am diuorced from my wife) yet the acceſſorie holds, that is, children which be wedlockes pledges, though their mother be not my wife, yet are they my children: they be morgaged by nature, and ſo muſt they euer continue. But if the caſe ſtand ſo, then why doth a ſonne forſake father and mother to cleaue vnto his wife? why doth he forſake the greater commandement, and betake him to the leſſe? becauſe in this caſe, the parents vnderhand be willing hereunto, as in a deſire to haue the world peopled, by propagation of children, ſo to maintaine a lineall ſucceſſion in poſterity, and the inheritance

euer

euer to deſcend vpon the grandchild after the death of the ſonne and heire. And yet to keepe houſe with a wife, in anie conſtruction, is this, to leaue or abandon ones father? nay herein conſiſts their principall dutie and obedience. And if they marrie, and keepe houſe togither and ſo deduct as it were new Colonies, all is done with leaue, and reference to their parents. And for my part, I would faine know, how it can in anie ſence be conſtrued that for a man to marrie a wife is to forſake and relinquiſh his father and mother, whereas children though they be maried neuer ſo often, are not thereby exempted from obedience, and though they be eftſoones man and wife, yet be they ſtil in ſubiection to their father? and mariage changes not the lawes of nature, and ciuilitie? But be it as it may be, almightie God calling to his remembrance the law which firſt he eſtabliſhed in paradiſe, added alſo this heauenlie diuine commandement to *Adams* ſentence, that whether children marrie or not marrie his oracle ſhould continue without all exception and inſtance to the contrarie, *honour thy father and thy mother*: yea and that in more preciſe and determinate manner of ſpeech than if he ſhould haue ſaid obey father or mother, for obedience is contained in honour, and he that is

not bound to obey, must neuertheleſſe be bound to honor. For examples ſake, if by extremitie and rigour of law, you may marry or profeſſe your ſelfe a monke, againſt my will, and that ſuch a vow and mariage, is in a ſort iuſtifiable and good, yet ſhould you notwithſtanding euen by force of that commandement come and aske me firſt leaue, and craue mine aduiſe in the matter, which though it be no obedience in your part yet it is mine honor. Laſtlie you ſhould haue ſhewed me, what mooued you to this or that courſe of life, whether your owne naturall propenſion, and deliberate inclination, or ſome ſtrange circumuention & forraine perſwaſion? But let that dutie and cuſtome be omitted, and let the act neuertheleſſe, be accounted as lawfull as is anie, yet where is the honor which God hath preſcribed? where is that reuerence and dutie, which humanitie bindeth you vnto? if it be done onelie but for ſolemnitie, why then you muſt know that ſolemnity giues the eſſence to the act. Let vs proceed. It is ſtoried by *Marius Victor* that famous orator of *Marſeiles* in his third title of his Commentarie vpon *Geneſis*, that God commaunded not *Abraham* (albeit from his youth vp he worſhipped the true God with all his ſoule, and abhor-

abhorred gentilisme) to leaue his country, and that wicked land and polluted house, before that he saw, that after his fathers death, hee might without offence keepe that commandement, which he had giuen him. What shall we say thē? that the Iesuits haue greater command ouer thee, then God had ouer *Abraham*: he was 75. yeere old, and his parents were dead, before God commanded him that he should leaue his couutry, and goe vp vnto the land of *Canaan*, & dost thou which art yet but 16. yeers old, my selfe and thy mother yet liuing, forsake me & thy countrie, because the Iesuits bid thee? if thou dost it for the keeping of anothers vow, yet that dutie which both by the law of God and nature, thou owest me is greater. But *Marius* of *Marseiles* (for your learning) liued in the time of *Theodosius* and *Valence* the Emperors, and the Iesuits were not heard of: there were no such creatures, till the raign of *Francis* the first our King. Moreouer why did God command the same *Abraham*, to sacrifice vnto him his owne sonne, and to be the Priest himself, but because he thought the counsell of the fathers was expedient to be vsed in euerie cause, that concerned their children? if it had been all one vnto God, who had offered vp *Isacke* vnto him, and if

the sacrifice should haue been as gratefull and acceptable vnto him being offered by another man as by the hands of his owne father, why surelie he would haue commanded this office to some other, rather than to his father *Abraham*. For religion is not the holier or the more sanctified because it is ioined with parricide. what then? God would haue *Isaacke* offered vp vnto him. But because this oblation was to proceed from his father, he commanded him to doe it, who by reason of his fatherlie authoritie, could not offend in slaying him. *A father is not guilty of parricide, saith Ælius Martianus* the great counsellor at the Ciuill law. If thou wilt say that in *Isack* & *Samuel* the cause, why it was necessarie that their parents should offer them to the Lord, was by reason of their minoritie, in regard they were yong & vnder age: why the daughter of *Iephthe* for certaine was sacrificed by her father (as was *Praxithea by Erictheus, and Calpurnia, by her father Marius*) *after the Cimbrian war*, when she was fit for mariage. Moreouer what might be obiected against *Eliseus*? he being called to the office of a Prophet (which was a regular and strict kind of life, as appeared both by their vnction, mantell and abstinence) albeit he was an elder in yeers and called thereunto by the Prophet *Elias*,

and

and that by a ſpeciall command from God, made this anſwer, *I pray thee let me goe kiſſe my father and my mother, and then I will follow, thee.* The kiſſe was the fathers benediction, & the leaue was that which he deſired ſo much of the Prophet, to take before his departure? what ſaid *Elias*? *Goe and return, for what was my dutie, I haue done vnto thee.* As if he ſhould haue ſaid, *that which remaineth to be done, belongeth to thy parents.* For although God expreſſlie commanded me, that I ſhould annoint thee to be a Prophet, in my roome, after me, yet how could this be done, if theſe ſecond Gods our parents, ſhould haue gaine ſaid it? therefore afterwards when the Prophet had caſt his mantell on him, forthwith *Elizeus* left his plough, and followed *Elias*. But he departed not from his father, before he had firſt taken his leaue of him. Certaine it is, that in the time of the old law perſonall vowes were ranſomed by monie, and the vowes of the *Nazarites* endured but for a time. But in the thirtieth Chapter of *Numbers*, it is ſo manifeſtlie ſet downe what ought to be obſerued concerning the daughter, that it were ſhame for a mâ to vouch anie thing to the contrarie. *If a woman* (ſaith *Moſes*) *vowe a vowe, and bind her ſelfe with an oath, being in her fathers houſe, her vowe ſhall ſtand, except ſhe hath done it, againſt her*

her fathers conſent. But leaſt her youth might be pretended for an excuſe, the ſame is written of a wife alſo, whether ſhe as yet remaine in her fathers houſe, or whether ſhe be brought vnto her husbands, her vowe ſhould not ſtand, if her husband conſented not vnto it. *Moſes* excepted none beſides a woman diuorced, or a widdow; whence was this? becauſe Gods power was leſſened, by reaſon the fathers or husbands conſent, concurred with his? ſurelie no. But becauſe thoſe very powers which they haue, are from God, and by eſtabliſhing theirs, he confirmeth his owne. But thoſe exceptions of widdowhood or matrimonie vere not neceſſarie in a ſonne; For as ſoone as he was out of his fathers command there was no doubt, if he were at mans ſtate, but he might lawfullie bind himſelfe with any of thoſe vowes, which were admitted in the old law. For except it were with the vowe of *faſting or abſtinence* from meates, they ſcarce bound themſelues with anie other. But a woman (as at *Rome*) was in perpetuall wardſhip ſometimes of her father, ſometimes of her husband, and ſometimes alſo of her brother, if her father died before ſhe was married. Wherefore if the woman voweda vowe, there the lawgiuer you may ſee) was more cautelous and difficult. But of the ſonne ſo long as he remai-

remained in his fathers houſe, who euer douted in that caſe, but that he was of the ſame condition with his ſiſter? vowed he the gift of anie peece of monie? why it was anothers monie? vowed he his owne perſon? vvhy he had no right to it? that was ſubiect vnto another. How then could he, vvhich vvas not at his owne diſpoſall, bind himſelfe and vvrong his father, vvho had all dominion and rule ouer him. It wil not be wel, to ſay that there was more dutie expected from vvomen than from men. For tell me, vvhy did thoſe ancient lawyers ſo much varie in the queſtion, vvhether the ſonnes of a furious and phranticke man might contract mariage, and yet did all agree that the daughter might. Why did they make ſuch doubt of the ſonne? vvas it not becauſe he vvas the pillar and proppe of the familie? in him was the hope of their poſteritie? from him vvas expected the continuance of their ſtocke, and on him depended the line of their petigree? therefore it is requiſite that greater care be had, that he be not diſparaged in his match, of vvhom more reuerence, more reſpect, and more obedience is required. If hee enter into nevv alliance, if he make his father a grandfather, and beget an heire for him, ought not all this to be done with more aduice, and circumſpection than ordinarie.

And

And was it not alſo, becauſe age in a ſonne did not ſo importune and call for mariage, but in a daughter it did euen enforce and haſten it before her time? A ſonne, albeit he ſtaied till his father were perfectlie recouered, and well in his wits, there was no inconuenience befell, for thereby his iudgement was ripened, and he prooued the worthier man after, (and I may tell you) good behauiour is as neceſſarie at home as abroad, if old *Cato* may be beleeued. But a daughter may be the worſe, if ſhe ſtay beyond her time. And that did *Phalaris* once tell *Clæneta* that for the ſame reaſon, ſhe ſhould not defer the mariage of her daughter that was twentie yeers old in anie caſe, becauſe her father *Philodamus* was abſent in a forraine countrie. For he was trauelled farther, than that her daughter might conuenientlie expect his returne home. But concerning a ſon percaſe he would haue altered his opnion. It followeth therefore that what *Moſes* did forbid in a daughter, he would haue much more forbidden in a ſonne likewiſe.

But you thinke it long perchance ere I come to the times of chriſtianitie, you do wel. For that is the point of the card whereunto all our courſes ſhould be intended and directed. Chriſtian religion (you will ſay) otherwiſe determines of childrens dutie. Let vs

ſee

ſee then whether Chriſt came to deſtroy it, or to perfect it, corrupt & mar all good manners, by abrogating God his fathers precepts to teach children contempt and ſtubborne behauiour, or rather whether it were not laid as an imputation vpon him, to the end it might bee beleeued, that hee did deface all reſpect of amity and alleagiance, to rent in ſunder all dutifull affection, and make heart-burning and diſcord betweene the father and his children, as ſaith Saint *Ambroſe* writing vpon Saint *Luke*? We will therefore beginne with Chriſt himſelfe, and afterward come vnto the Church, where if your more refined Diuines haue anything for me, that is in truth more learned and witty, let it haue the victory: for albeit we are all Chriſtians, yet all of vs are not interpreters of the faith: therefore all ſuch Diſputes of greater myſterie, wee leaue to deepe Diuines; and will content our ſelues with ſuch as are obuious and triuiall. Chriſt was twelue yeers olde (*Luke* 2.24.) when hee went vp to *Ieruſalem* with *Mary* and *Ioſeph*, but forſooke them at their departure, therefore they returned backe to *Ieruſalem* to ſeeke him, and it came to paſſe, that three dayes after they found him in the Temple ſitting among the Doctors; to whom *Mary* ſaid; *Sonne why haſt thou*

thou thus dealt with vs? thy Father and I haue sought thee with heauy hearts. Hee answered somewhat obscurely, but yet (if I am not deceiued) no lesse fitlie for the mitigation of their sorrow, (than thou suppossest that thou hast done for the appeasing of mine anger) viz. *That it is better to obey God than men.* Yet he returned and went downe with his parents, and came to *Nazareth*, and was subiect vnto them, saith *Luke* in his Gospell. did he euer afterwards forsake them? no not vntill the time of his passion. But I pray thee, let vs heare farther, what *Bernard* the Abbot saith. Although *Mary* and *Ioseph* vnderstood Christs words (for it is likely they did) because he thus bespake them, *Knew you not that I must goe about my Fathers businesse?* yet notwithstanding they would not bee quiet, saith hee in his 19. Sermon on *Solomon*, but would haue him obedient vnto them: therefore all the rest of his time, he euer afterwardes followed them. Now, from whom may we draw a better patterne of obedience and duety towards parents for children, than from Christ. Learne (saith S. *Ambrose* vpon these words) what thou owest to thy parents, when thou readest that a sonne was neuer contrary to his father, either in fulfilling his will, performing his duty, or obseruing his opportunity. Thou

owest

oweſt to thy mother the hazarding of her chaſtity, the loſſe of her Virginity, her perill in thy birth, her tedious ſorrowes, her continual troubles (who, wretched as ſhe is) is then in greateſt danger, when ſhe hath the fruition of her deſires, and brought forth the ſonne of her deſire: for albeit ſhe is free from the ſorrow in his birth; yet is ſhee not free from the feare of his death. What need I ſpeak of thoſe Fathers, which are ſo prouident for their childrens good? or of the riches which they haue ſo multiplied and laied vp for them? or of being ſo warie husbands for their childrens thrift? might not this goodneſſe of theirs at the leaſt, challenge ſome tribute of obedience? The ſame Author in his firſt booke *de Virginibus*, ſaith, how ſweete a pledge is that which hath its beginning in perill, and its ending in perill, which firſt is a griefe vnto parents before it can bee a pleaſure vnto them? The Maſter diſdained not (ſaith *Bernard*) to follow his Diſciples, nor God to follow men, nor the word and wiſdome it ſelfe to follow a Carpenter and his wife: and yet *Ioſeph* was not properly his father. Ieſus fulfilled the will both of his heauenly and earthly father, teaching vs thereby that nothing hinders, but that they may bee both obeyed at once, and that it is not neceſſarie, that one ſhould be neg-

neglected for the other. *Iustin Martyr* out of this place in his 136. question, handles some other questions also very wisely, (as he vseth to doe all.) If it bee forbidden by Gods holy Scripture, to contemne our parents, (saith he) and if he who dooth that which is forbidden, is to bee tearmed a sinner; how commeth it to passe that our Lord Iesus Christ in many places despised his parents, and yet neuertheleſſe is saide to bee without sinne? For at the marriage of *Cana* hee checked his mother, saying: *Woman what haue I to doe with thee?* And when his mother would faine haue seene him, he called those his mother and his brethren, *that did the will of God*: Furthermore, when it was said vnto him, *Blessed is the wombe that bare thee, and the pappes that gaue thee sucke*: hee replyed, *yea blessed are they that obey the will of God.* All which words are thought to bee spoken of him in some contempt of his mother; because whereas shee was properly called blessed; others in oppolition of her by him, were tearmed blessed also. But now since this most holy Virgin was chosen for the conception and birth of our Sauiour Christ, how came it to passe, that shee was accounted vnworthie to be called blessed? Here *Iustin Martyr* maketh this answere. These words (*what haue I*

to

to doe with thee?) were not ſpoken by way of obiurgation, but as if he ſhould haue ſaide in other tearmes; I am not ſuch a one as haue vndertaken the care of wine, which is ſpent in marriages; yet notwithſtanding if your deſire bee that there bee no want of wine, bid the ſeruants doe whatſoeuer I ſhall ſay vnto you, and you ſhall eaſily perceiue there ſhall bee no want of Wine; which as he ſpake, ſo it fell out. Therefore it is not likely that he did checke his mother in wordes, that did ſo much honour her in deedes. As for other places Chriſt ſpake not ſo, as if hee would depriue her of that honour, which was due vnto a mother; but he taught her how ſhe was entituled to true bleſſednesse. For if hee that heareth the word of God, and keepeth it bee Chriſts brother, ſiſter and mother; and Chriſts mother hath done both theſe, then it is cleare, that *Mary* in this reſpect ought rather to be called bleſſed. And becauſe God choſe not an ordinary woman to be the mother of Chriſt, but ſuch a one that was of all other the moſt excellent in perfection and vertues, therefore Chriſt would that his mother ſhould bee moſt commended for that vertue, which gaue her preheminence aboue all women, that a Virgine ſhould become his mother. Moreouer *Luke* the Euangeliſt

uangelist testifieth, that Christ neuer did any thing in contempt or disgrace of his parents, when he saith, *Hee went downe with Ioseph and Mary to Ierusalem, and was obedient to them, euen to his death:* And so also saith S. *Augustine* interpreting these wordes in his booke, *De Sancta Virgine.* Now Christ after that hee began to preach to the people, and withall perceiued that the Scribes and Pharisies did erre most grosly in this commandement, whereof we treat, and retorted the same against their parents, vnder this colour, that forsooth they might performe any thing else in stead of their bounden duety, so they did that which they thought to be as iust and holy, said, *Why doe you transgresse the law of God by your tradition? for God hath said, Honour thy father and mother, and hee that curseth father or mother let him die the death: but yee say, Whosoeuer shall say vnto his father or mother, by the gift that is offered by mee thou mayest haue profite, though hee honour not his Father and Mother, he shall bee safe. O yee hypocrites, yee worship God in vain, preferring mans precepts before Gods.* Why spake Christ this so seuerely? was it because the Pharisies so greatly abused those offerings, and that sacred treasure which they called *Corban?* or was it because those oblations, which were destinated vnto the Temple, were by

by them miſapplyed to themſelues, and to their owne luſts, and not vnto God? ſurelie no, for then hee would haue noted onely their luxurie and abuſe. But hee checked the prieſts becauſe they made compariſon of precepts, and preferred their owne (which were otherwiſe good) before Gods. And becauſe they tooke occaſion by their gift, howſoeuer holy to contemne their domeſticke rites and lawes of piety, and that bond of naturall duty which is more ancient thā any whatſoeuer. And yet there is ſomwhat more in it, then ſo: For the firſt commandement, that you ſtand ſo much vpon, and the fifth you ſo lightly regard, are both Gods commandements, they both iſſue from the ſame Author, and the ſame Law-maker. It is neceſſary therfore that either the one hinder the other, or that the latter be abrogated by the former (which is againſt all law that euer I could reade) or elſe that both of thē be kept, as well the firſt pertaining vnto God, as the fifth pertaining vnto parents. But the truth is, that ſome precepts are immutable, and they are (ſayeth *Hildebert* in his laſt Epiſtle) ſuch as the eternall decree of God hath eſtabliſhed. Of which ſort (ſaith the Archbiſhop of *Towres*) are theſe, *Thou ſhalt loue the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy ſoule,*

and thy neighbour as thy ſelfe. And honour thy Father and thy mother, and ſuch like: Other precepts are mutable, which the eternall Law of God hath not decreede, but the wiſdome and policy of ſome later wittes haue inuented for ſome conuenience and vſe, & not ſo principally tending to ſaluation. And of this ſort it is to be a Ieſuite; Certaine I am, that the law, whereby thou ſtandeſt bounde vnto mee, is perpetuall and vnchangeable. But what if here we be bolde to ſay, that God himſelfe is leſſe ſollicitous for his owne honour, than for our parents honor? And therfore of thoſe two commandements, the latter in a ſort is to be preferred before the former. And ſhall yet theſe Phariſies pleaſe thee more than Chriſt? It was not without a miſterie, that God gaue thoſe commandements concerning his owne honour ſimply, without impoſition of puniſhment, if any brake them, or propoſall of rewarde if any kept them: but when he gaue this commandement concerning our duty towards our parents, he added this clauſe, *that thy dayes may be long vpon earth*. For albeit hereby it bee clearely euident, that nature cannot ſuffer, that he ſhould liue long vpon the earth, that reſpectes not theſe of whom he hath receiued life, nor endure that it ſhould goe well with him any where,

where, that will hide himſelfe for no other end, but that he may not ſhew himſelfe grateſull vnto them that with ſo great care and trouble after they had giuen him life, haue nouriſhed and ſuſtained him; yet that which wee ſo principally intend, appeares from thence. For he ſayth that he is full of iealouſie, if a man worſhippe ſtrange and falſe gods; but if he worſhippe his parents, God is ſo farre from enuying it, that by all meanes poſſible, he wils and commãds it, & that with ſuch a reward, which of mankind is moſt deſired. Why preſſeth he all theſe things ſo earneſtly? becauſe when parents, theſe ſecond gods are honoured, whom hee ſo much acceptes, and ſo well accounteth of, whatſoeuer is done vnto them, he taketh it done vnto himſelfe: but if any duety bee left vndone vnto them, let vs worſhip him in the beſt manner wee can deuiſe, yet doth it not excuſe vs. And perhappes this may be the reaſon, that God (if I may ſo ſpeake) is not ſo hard to pleaſe in that honour and worſhip which wee owe vnto him, as euery man is curious in the duetie, which is to bee done vnto him. God is reuerenced as ſufficiently as he would be, if euerie one according to his ſexe, age, and quality do honour him as he is able. For it is not the Eccleſiaſticall dignity that makes a Chriſtian,

sayth *Ierome*. One man in the Church is an eye, another the tongue, another the hand, and another the foote or the eare. In whatsoeuer vocation a man be, if therein hee serue God as he is able, hee pleaseth God exceeding well. For God exacteth not the same obedience of all. But in man it is farre otherwise, except his sonne be obedient and dutifull at his becke, and at his seruice, when hee shall thinke fitte, he is by no meanes contented. Neither is it much materiall, of what condition both of them are, for whosoeuer is a father, is a father in the same proportion, and whosoeuer is a sonne, is a sonne in the same degree. Therefore that we may honour our parents without exception, and beyonde that voluntarie obedience, which wee ought to shew them, the Lord saith, this I will, this I commaund and for this duety I prolong thy yeares, that thou mayest performe it alwayes. What then? if Christ did iustly and deseruedly reprehend those Iewish Priestes, doest thou thinke (especially seeing both of vs professe one Religion) that thou being my sonne shouldest addict thy selfe to some certaine Colledge, Rule or Societie, (which say it bee lawfull and holy, yet is it but the inuention of men) and thereupon contemne and despise mee thy father (a sinne which God and Nature

ture hath forbidden thee?) Excepting that worſhippe, which wee owe vnto our God, (ſuch as is adoration and inuocation.) What is there in religion it ſelfe, more religious and more diuine, than to honour and reuerence our parents? Sacrifice is a holy worke, yet Chriſt (as you may ſee) leſſe eſteemeth it than the duety and obedience of children It is a holy and religious work for a man to deuote himſelfe vnto the Church, Miniſtery and ſeruice of the brethren. Neuertheleſſe S: *Paul* commaunds in his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* 5. Chapter, and 4. verſe: *If widdowes haue children or nephewes, let them learne firſt to ſhew godlineſſe to their owne houſe, and to recompence their parents, for that is honeſt and acceptable before God.* Certainely, if wee ought to chooſe any to that Miniſtery, hee or ſhee ought to be choſen, who are well reported of for their good works, and they are of this kinde, if *ſhee hath nouriſhed her children, &c.* Would *Paul* haue preſcribed this ſo earneſtly, except hee himſelfe being the author had well perceiued that there were ſome priuate and domeſticall duties, which of neceſſity were to bee preferred before all other, though ſacred and publique? the truth is, that theſe latter proceed from thoſe former. For when the queſtion is of morall and naturall inſtitution,

Christians differ in nothing from Pagans. He that liues contrary to Nature, keepes not Gods commandements, as *Nilus* saith in his institution to certaine Monks And as *Athenagoras* in his Apologie for Christians obserues; that God mooues not man to those things which are against Nature. And therefore Saint *Paul* spake nothing, but that which *Socrates* had spoke before him in *Zenophon*, & which the Athenians had long before thoght vpon and prouided for in their lawes. If any one be disobedient to his parents (sayth he in his 2. booke *de fact. & dict. Socrat.*) let him be vncapable of all Magistracy. For how can he offer pure Sacrifice or sit well at the sterne of the common-wealth, if hee be a bad liuer at home, and if he be vnkind, vnnatural and iniurious to the people of his own house? As for the lawes of the Athenians, you shall finde them in *Æschines* against *Timarchus*, & in *Plutarch* in the life of *Æschines*: but what saith Saint *Paul*? hee as if hee were in some emulation with *Socrates* sayth; *If there be any of you that prouideth not for his owne, namely for them of his owne houshold, hee denieth the faith, and is worse than an Infidell.* Now see what coniecture may be gathered of thee to the contrary. Certainely (say they) he cannot chuse but of necessitie bee most obedient to the generall

nerall, Prouinciall, Presbyters, who ſo reſolutely contemnes his Father, and ſo coragiouſly renounceth him for a ſtranger and a Publican. See (my good ſonne) how far thou art diuerted from the way of the Lorde, & how exceedingly thou art eſtranged from his commandements, although thou arrogantly thinkeſt, that thou doeſt know and vnderſtand them better, than all thy fathers and thy forefathers did, yea better than Chriſt himſelfe. Without doubt a father and a mother are not to be compared with God, yet are they to be beloued with God, ſaith *Tertullian* againſt the Gnoſtickes. And in his book *of Chaſtitie* he ſaith, *you may know by the placing of euery commandement, the manner: by the order, the ſtate, and by the end the reward: therefore hee which honoureth not his father and mother, is worſe then an adulterer, worſe than a murtherer, and worſe than a theefe.* But I had rather cõpare vertues with vertues, than vices vvith vices. vvhat is ſo good a work in the Church as to giue legacies to charitable vſes. And yet ſaith *S. Auguſtine, whoſoeuer will diſinherit his ſonne, and make the Church his heire, let him ſeeke one that will accept it, truly he ſhall not find that Auſtin will be his heire, and by Gods grace he ſhall find no man will be.* And in his 119. Epiſtle vnto *Ecdicias,*

dicias, doth he not reprehend her, becauſe ſhe vowed continencie not acquainting her huſband firſt with it? and when he had afterward conſented vnto her vowe, doth he not blame her becauſe ſhe tooke vpon her the habite of a Nunne, againſt his will? and did he not reproue her becauſe ſhe gaue her goods to two poore Monkes, when ſhe had a ſonne liuing on whom ſhe might haue beſtowed them? which I ſpeake not (ſaith he) as though I thought that if any of vs ſhould be ill ſpoken of and ſcandalized for our good works, therefore we ſhould deſiſt from doing them, but becauſe in euerie ſocietie the reſpect we beare to our kindred ought to be one, and the reſpect we ſhew to ſtrangers another, the condition of a chriſtian is one, and the condition of an infidel another, the duty of parents to their children one, and the dutie of children to their parents another. Write therefore vnto him a letter of ſatiſfaction and aske him pardon (ſaith he to *Eridicea*) becauſe thou haſt ſinned againſt him, and diſpoſed of thy goods after thy pleaſure, without his aduiſe, and contrary to his will: not that it repenteth thee, that thou didſt beſtow thy goods on the poor but becauſe thou wert vnwilling that he ſhold haue any ſhare or part in ſo charitable a worke. Is not the fact memorable, which is recor-

recorded of *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, who reſtored a deed of gift he had receiued of a father that then had no children, vnto him againe, when afterwards hee had children? For it is not likelie nor to be preſumed in any caſe that he had rather haue another man to be his heire, than his owne ſonne; See here a far better iudgement of filiall duety, than that which thoſe vpſtart Phariſies put vpon thee, viz. *That there is neither ſacrifice nor vow,* nor any oblation that is to be preferred before the obedience which God commands vnto children. But let vs proceed and try by examples borrowed from him, that is both God and man, whether it be true *that a man which is deſirous to take the miniſtery, or to lead a monaſtricall life, may renounce all kind of obedience, and that it is to no purpoſe for him to aſke his fathers conſent and iudgement in taking thoſe orders vpon him or no?* I pray thee whom did Chriſt call to be his Apoſtles? called he ſuch a one as thou art a yong boy? and tell me if they left their ſhips, their nets, and all their tackling to follow Chriſt, did they for all that leaue their parents? or if they left them did they leaue them without leaue? yea, which is more, did they that were husbands put away their wiues, or did they which were fathers, for that cauſe forſake their children? Certaine it is that

Iames

Iames and *Iohn* were aboue 25. yeers old, when they departed from their father. But did they further to ſhew their more impudencie in departing, leaue Iudea and trauaile into *Italie*, *Lorraine*, or *Spaine*? or elſe becauſe themſelues were Chriſtians, could they not endure to looke vpon their fathers? or was his preſence, ſpeech, or conuerſation, irkſome vnto them? Had they done ſo, they ſhould haue done otherwiſe than their Lord and Maſter had done before, who (as I ſaid) neuer went from *Mary* and *Ioſeph*. But that I may demonſtrate vnto thee, that they went not out of their country, or fathers houſes, vntill ſuch time as after Chriſts paſſion, they were to goe into the whole world, and that albeit after their calling, they accompanied Chriſt, yet neuertheles they were conuerſant at home, & dwelt with their parents; It is written that Ieſus came to the houſe of *Peter* and *Andrew*, where when he ſaw their mother in law ſicke of an ague, hee cured her, and forthwith ſhe miniſtred to him and to his diſciples. Therfore to follow Chriſt was not to forſake ones friends, his parents, his wife, his children, or his houſehold, yea (which is more) *Iames* and *Iohn*, albeit they were growen in yeeres, would not haue followed Chriſt, if *Zebedeus* their father had not conſented thereunto.

unto. For ſeeing they were together, with their father, whē *Chriſt* bad them followhim, it cannot be but that either *Zebedeus* did expreſſe his conſent in words, or imply it by holding his peace. But tell mee whether thou thinkeſt all vocations be of one kind, as well they that proceede expreſlie from Gods immediate will, as they whereunto the Church calleth vs? God knoweth directlie and changeth the hearts of men, therefore he is not deceiued. But men in their elections doe onlie coniecture and gheſſe, wherefore they oftentimes exceedinglie erre? for to be a man and ſubiect to error be termes conuertible: as to be God and not to be ſubiect to error. what then? why we had need vſe all diligence and be verie warie, in theſe vocations ſo that no ſolemnitie be paſſed ouer eſpecially the conſent & good leaue of our parents. If I ſhould alleadge that place vnto thee, where Chriſt ſaid vnto his Apoſtles. *Suffer little ones to come vnto me*, thou wouldſt ſay, that there he ſpeaketh of ſuch as are yong in age. And in very deed you ſhall find in the Goſpell *that theſe little ones were brought vnto Chriſt, and that they came not of their owne accord vnto him*, therefore he ſaid not, *Come vnto me, but ſuffer them to come*, and againe *forbid them not*, to teach that the *calling of little ones*, as well as their

whereupon they dispute thus: Buriall is a very religious and holie dutie, especiallie if it be done to a mans father. But Christ neuertheleſſe willeth vs rather to attend him, than the buriall of our parents. Againe, laymen are accounted as dead men, for they which are so hampered and entangled in the pleasures of this world, that they cannot swim out of them, may iustlybe esteemed for drowned and dead men. Hence saith S. *Paul, The widdow that liueth in pleasure, is dead while she liueth.* 1. Timoth. 5. 6. The cleargie men on the contrarie may properlie be said to liue. For they are the part and portion of the liuing God, therefore well may he be said to abstaine from the dead, who hath left his father and his mother to follow Christ (that is as they make it) to bea Iesuit. Verie acutelie collected, Sir, but we haue our answer in a readinesse for you. First it followeth not, that whatsoeuer was pronounced of Christ must forthwith necessarilie be applied to the Clergie, and all such at haue betaken themselues to a regular course of life. Indeed all his doctrine was deliuered ouer vnto them, but not all power, saith *Tertullian*, in his book of *Chastitie*. And verilie it is one thing, to embrace Christ and another thing to follow, so manie orders of monks as be now adaies; yea though there

their Baptiſme did depend both, vpon their fathers, tutors and curators ſuit and promiſe made for them. But whereas it was ſaid ouer and aboue, *forbid them not*, that was not ſpoken to their parents, but to the diſciples, that found fault with ſuch as brought them vnto Chriſt: and this without doubt is ſpoken of ſuch as are in their minoritie. But that which was before alleadged, makes no diſtinction at all of anie age. It is written to all in generall tearmes, *Honour your parents*. I know when the ſonne is once come to fiue and twenty, that then his fathers approbation, yea his diſſimulation, and which is more, his very ſilence, (ſuch as was that of *Zebedeus*) goeth for his conſent. But yet that, ſuch as it is, is verie requiſite. Neither canſt thou depart from thy father or mother if they be vnwilling. What ſaid I? from thy parents? I ſay thou canſt not goe from thy brethren or thy kindred (for S. *Paul* ſpeakes generallie of the whole familie) but thou muſt perforce ſinne againſt God and be guiltie of a cruell and faithleſſe conſcience. But I ſuppoſe there is a text alleadged thee to the contrarie, that when one of Chriſts diſciples deſired him, that he would permit him to goe and burie his father, before that he followed him, Ieſus replied vnto him, *Follow me and ſuffer the dead to burie their dead*, where-

there were ſmall ods between them and thoſe of whom *Dorotheus* ſpake of old. Secondlie, when the father of that diſciple was once dead, that exact reuerence which perhaps he pretended to Chriſt, ceaſed, and was no longer to be performed. For it was certaine that he was then no longer a ſonne. Laſtlie, the Lord commanded not that the burial ſhould be whollie omitted, but that it ſhould be procured to be done by ſome other, and whoſouer that was, he was ſaid to celebrate his fathers funerall, in regard that we commonly call all thoſe, which are departed out of this life before vs, *our fathers or forefathers*. The charge and coſt of funeralls is a publique buſineſſe, ſaith *Papinian* the ſanctuarie of the law, whence alſo *Iuſtinian* in his 43. and 59. *Nouell* manifeſtlie ſheweth, that in *Conſtantinople* the charge and expences of funeralls was wont to be defraied out of the publique treaſurie. Why therefore ſhould this celebration hinder the diſciple frō following Chriſt, ſince that it might be done as well by another as by himſelfe. But yet ther is great difference whether children deſtitute their parents in malice or pure ſimplicity. This expoſition will ſerue thee againſt all theſe arguments wherewith they haue beguiled thee. If thy parents be dead, that is if they be Iewes,

If

if Idolaters, if Pagans, if Infidels, & if the ſon contrariwiſe be a chriſtian, if a Catholique, and the father would burie this his ſonne with him, that is, command him to commit idolatrie, *leaue this father and follow mee* (ſaith Chriſt) *let the dead burie this dead.* That theſe words ought ſo to be taken, and vnderſtood, is cleare bothout of *S. Ambroſe*, when he ſaith, *The ſonne is not diſſwaded from his duty towards his fathers, but a beleeuer is ſeuered from the fellowſhip of an vnbeleeuer*. And alſo out of *S. Auſtin* as well in that one booke of *obſeruations on S. Mathew*, as in his firſt booke to *Marcellian conc erning the Baptiſme of children*. Canſt thou therefore perſwade any man that the Ieſuits onlie liue the beſt kind of life, and that we miſerable chriſtians, becauſe we are of the laitie muſt be reputed for dead and buried. S. *Hierome* writing vnto *Furia* thinketh far otherwiſe: whoſoeuer beleeueth in Chriſt (ſaith hee) liueth. And *Tertullian* in his booke, *de carne Chriſti*, doth not therefore ranke *Marcion* among thoſe that were dead, becauſe he was not a Monke or an Hermit, but becauſe whilſt he was an heretique, he was not truly and properly a good chriſtian. But we fathers, poore men though we be, euen we are beleeuers we are called the ſonnes of God, his friends, his brethren, and coheires

with

with him, and wee alſo are made partakers through him of the holy Ghoſt. As many as haue a true faith, and lead an vpright life, yea although they worke not miracles, nor caſt out diuells, yet they are holie, ſaith *S. Hierome* in his 59. *Homilie*. But if you pretend the ſame, yea, if thou boaſt of greater things than theſe, why this alſo is our benefit, this alſo is our aduantage. For if you aske any of vs Chriſtians of what religion we are, euerie of vs being taught by you, can make you this anſwer: of the ſame religion, whereof our fathers and anceſtors were. There was no oath more inuiolable, than that which wee ſware by our *fathers faith*, ſaith *Philo*, who borrowed this ſentence of an ancient Philoſopher: therefore why thou ſhouldſt ſo excedinglie deſpiſe vs, now there is no reaſon: or if thou wilt needs contemne vs, doe it then, when we can expect nothing from thy hands but our buriall. You ſhall haue in this caſe if not the meaning, yet the words of Chriſt to his Diſciples, when our Sauiour Chriſt ſaid vnto him follow me, he well knevv that his father was novv dead, ſaith the ſame *S. Ambroſe* in this verie place. But I beleeue the text in *S. Matthewes* Goſpell hath moſt ſeduced thee. *He that loueth father or mother more than mee, is not worthy of me*: And againe in *S. Luke*, if

any

any man commeth vnto me and hateth not his father and his mother, his wife and his children, his brethren and his ſiſters, yea and his owne ſoule, he cannot be my diſciple. Theſe and ſuch like places ſeem to yeeld thee great and forceable arguments for thy defence: but ſince thoſe reaſons and authorities, which we haue already brought to the contrarie, be as pregnant and forceable to all intents, it had been your courſe to infer, that ſurelie theſe latter places do require ſome farther expoſition and declaration, leaſt God ſhould ſeem to be contrary, or to contradict himſelfe. For, I pray you, tell me, what manner of doctrine is this, or what kind of religion may this be called, which teacheth, that a man *of neceſſity muſt hate his father, and his mother, his wife, and his children, his brethren and his ſiſters, yea his owne deare ſoule alſo that will be Chriſts diſciple,* if we ſhould ſticke vnto the words and not ſtand vnto the meaning? for if he that ſhould hate his father, muſt therefore be a good diſciple, doubtleſſe he that ſhould well beate him, were worthy to be a patriarch, and hee that ſhould kill him, might exceedinglie well deſerue to be a Pope. See how many abſurdities and miſchiefes, would ariſe from theſe words, not ill conceiued, but il vnderſtood. So *S. Chryſoſtome* in his 36. homily, vpon S. *Mat-*

thews Gospell, he did not absolutelie command thee, to make inuectiue speeches, against thy familiar friends and acquaintance, for that were an action sauouring of indiscretion, and might procure harme. But look how much any other desires to haue thee loue him more than me, hate him, saith he, so much the more. I confesse then that we ought rather to loue God than our parents: and that is the lesson which *Salomon* teacheth vs, *begin your loue with me*, as *Origen* witnesseth. Which is also spoken by S. *Ambrose* on S. *Luke*, if men ought to performe dutie to their parents, how much more then ought they to render their most bounden dutie, to the creator and maker of their parents, in yeelding him alwaies thanks, that gaue thē parents. But I am much mistaken if the consequence hold, *ergo*, it is more blessed, to become a *Franciscan* Frier, or a Iesuit, than either to loue or reuerence thy father. For christian religion is grounded especiallie vpon faith, but doth not depend, vpon this or that particular order of religion. Nay I may further tell you many a generall Councell haue been summoned, that neuer confirmed or approued these orders. And if (put case) it be a degree of more perfection to be a Cleargie man than a lay man, I thinke it must not be inferred, *ergo*, a sonne need not refraine

refraine anie ſtubborne vndutifull or vngodly behauiour to his parents, if he intend to be a Prieſt rather than a lay man. God hath no where (that I cā find) laid any ſuch preciſe cō-mandemēt, on either of vs both to be Prieſts, his eſpeciall charge to thee wards, is that thou ſhouldſt doe me honor, by all meanes. Haſt thou then wilfullie done me this open wrong? thy ſinne is of ſo hainous a nature, that Gods curſe & mans is vpon thee for it. For I tel thee ſonne it is a matter of meer indifferency to be one of the Ieſuits companie. A man may be a good chriſtian, and walke in the way of Chriſt, which is the path to euerlaſting life, and yet neuer turne Ieſuit for the matter. And therefore it ill became thee to put by an act of abſolute neceſſitie, for a proiect of thine owne priuate fancie, & voluntarie concept, as *S. Thomas* verie wiſelie informeth thee. I pray thee tell me, if there were two waies to follow Chriſt in, and the one were ſo faire and plaine, that thou mightſt loue me, and thy ſauiour Chriſt alſo, the other ſo ſtonie and craggie that vnleſſe thou didſt perfectly hate me, it were impoſſible for thee to loue him, which of theſe waies wouldſt thou rather chuſe? but (O ſonne) S. *Matthew* and S. *Luke* are ſo cleer in this point, that there is not ſo much as the leaſt letter which may caſt thee into any

such labyrinth, or intricate maze. Read these Euangelists and read them from the beginning to the end, thou shalt find it deliuered, that if question be of vndergoing martyrdome for Christ (which they call *to tarrie the crosse and follow him*) and these two should be in tearmes of opposition, *To deme God before men, or to honor and loue ones father*, it is farre better to hate father, yea to hate himselfe and his owne soule, than once to distrust the promises of his sweet Sauior Christ. So then if I should haue perswaded thee to abiure the Christian baptisme, wherunto I first brought thee, and might well enough haue beene thy Bishop in it, had I aduised thee to cast away that most pretious pearle, which *S. Iohn* the Apostle gaue him that told him where hee might find the woluish God that had yeere by yeere had 12. young children offered vp vnto him for sacrifice, had I requested thee to renege Christianitie, to entertaine Mahometisme, Atheisme, or heresie (I may not haue thee tell me now with *Saluianus*, that such a time may happen, wherein some thing that is not God ought to be preferred before God) then mightst thou by vertue of this scripture, in these cases haue lawfully refused to do me such duty, and reuerence, as appertaineth to a father: and *Saturus*, or the worthy

Lady

Lady *Victoria*, would haue been good precedents for thy imitation (of whom *Victor* the Biſhop reporteth in his firſt booke *De perſecutione Vandalica*, that they had rather be held from their children, parted from their husbands, depriued of all their worldly wealth, than by any ſeducements whatſoeuer, become Arrians. In ſuch a caſe it would haue been good for thee, to haue been without father or mother like *Melchiſedech*, who was therefore ſaid to be without both, becauſe he was a deuout holy man, though his parents were wicked, and cruell *Cananites*. Heathen people loue their natiue country exceedingly, and none can haue any part in their loue but their parents. Now we (ſaith *Pontius, S. Cyprians* Deacon) we deteſt and abhor our very parents, when once they goe about to perſwade vs for anie thing againſt our God. But ſith we are both good chriſtians and Catholiks, who ſhould preuaile more with thee than my ſelfe, that haue done more for thee than all the world beſides? if any father might be iuſtlie deſpiſed of his childe, abuſed and wronged by him, choaked with that text in *Leuiticus* (*I am ignorant, I know you not*) certainlie it were ſuch a father, as ſhold dedicate his childrē to ſtrange Gods, or aduow them to the worſhip of the molten Calfe, according to that of

Moses, (let thy hand be vpon them and powr foorth their blood which would seduce thee from the truth) in which place notwithstanding, maybe obserued, as also out of the 32. of *Exodus*; that although *Moses* in this case, allowes of parricide, yet he exemplifieth it in the wife, in the sonne, in the brother, in the sister, in the kinsman and friend, he makes no mention at all of the father. So sacred, venerable, and inuiolable is that name of a father, nothing may lawfullie be attempted against a father. Read the Epistle of *Moses*, *Maximus*, *Nicostratus*, *Rufinus*, and other Confessors (it is the 77.) to *Cyprian*, thou shalt find these words vnderstood in this sence; peruse likewise *Chrisostome* in his 65. homilie vpon *S. Matthew*, where he expounds them. These words (saith he) to my vnderstanding, closelie do betoken persecutions. For many sonnes haue been drawn to wicked courses by their parents, manie husbands by their wiues, which whensoeuer they attempt, let them neither be respected for wiues, nor parents. And the author which wrote on the same Euangelist in his 27. homilie. It is not to be beleeued (saith he) that God which commanded thee to honor thy father and mother, would bid thee forsake father and mother: if therefore thou hast an vnbeleeuing father, continue thy obe-

obedience to him for in ſo doing, thou ſhalt receiue the reward of thy dutie, and contrariwiſe he ſhall find the condemnation of his infidelitie. And therefore our Sauior ſaid not he that loueth his father is not worthy of me, but he that loueth his father or mother, more than me, is not worthy of me. For as to loue our parents after God it is dutie, ſo to honor them more than God, is plaine impietie. If therefore (he repeats it againe) thou haſt an vnbelieuing father, ſtill obey him, but if hee would haue thee ſwallowed into the gulfe of infidelitie, loue God more than thy father, for he is the father not of the ſoule, but of thy bodie onlie. Howſoeuer yet, he doth not require that the ſonne vpon any ſuch occaſion, ſhould deſert him by his bodily preſence, but by diſſenting from him in point of religion. Marke how theſe words of the olde law, *theſe men, ſaith the Lord, haue kept my commaundementes, which haue ſaide vnto father and mother we know you not*) are expounded by *Philoſtratus* ſometimes Biſhop of *Brixia*, and S. *Auſtins* ancient. in his booke of hereſies. You are not to vnderſtand hereby, to condemne your father, for begetting you, but to condemne the groſſe impietie of your father that would miſlead you. And this was the opinion of *Salonius* Biſhop

of *Vienna*, writing vpon *Ecclesiastes*. For the profession of our faith in Christ, wee must contemne, yea and hate, father and mother, and all our kindred, when they be anie stops or impediments vnto vs, in the way of the Lord: as vve read that the holy Martyrs, manie times did: whence it is that S. *Austin* in his sermons, saith, these words, seeme to encourage men to martyrdome. Finallie, Christ Iesus himselfe being readie to giue vp the ghost (to speake in the words of *Arnold* the Abbot) that he might superlatiuelie commend this noble and great article of the second table, *Honour thy father and thy mother*, and that by al the bonds and leagues of pietie, doth giue & bequeath it to his mother the blessed virgin, (*woman behold thy sonne*) and to his best beloued disciple *S. Iohn*, (*behold thy mother*). And that S. *Iohn* was likewise of his masters mind, *Prochirus* relateth Chap. 21. for hauing baptized *Chrysippa* in the Iland *Pathmos*, and she would thereupon in all speed leaue hir vnbeleeuing husband, *S. Iohn* told her, no, that is by no meanes to be permitted, for God hath not sent me to separate man & wife, I haue no such commission, & therfore returne in peace to your owne house. For if it were lawfull, that a woman might separate her selfe from her husband, yet were it not expedient (saith

S. Au-

Auſten in his book *De Adulterinis coniugijs*) to *Pollentius*. Now if it ſhould be ſaid, that in theſe daies there be no martyrdomes, and therfore the former expoſition wil not now hold: then Gregorie the great in his 37. homily *De Diuerſis Euangelij lectionibus*, will giue this interpretation, that the place is to be meant of concupiſcence, and carnall affections. For then ſaith he, we truelie hate our owne ſoule, when wee repoſe not our ſelues on carnall deſires, when we ſubdue our inordinate appetite, and ſtriue againſt our delicious pleaſures. Yea but the Ieſuites buzze into thy eares, that twere better for thee to ſpurne and trample thy Father vnder thy feet than to be without a cowle. Well, then I would faine know for my better learning, whether S. *Iohn Chryſoſtom* attained to the true ſence of theſe words, of S. *Mathew* and S. *Luke*, (now wee are come to be tride by God & the Church) vvhen in his firſt book *de Sacerdotio*, he reports of himſelfe (and ſo doth *Leo* the Emperour report of him in a certaine Panegyricke oration) that hauing finiſhed the courſe of his ſtudies in the Vniuerſity of Athens hee returned to Antioch, and there through the often admonitions of one *Baſilius* (for it was not *Baſil* the great, if wee may take *Simeon Metaphraſtes* his worde) had a great longing to haue beene a monke, vvho hin-

hindred him from his courſe of deuotion, for hee vvas pittifullie perplexed a long vvhile? It was no conceit of nonage, hee vvas then 25. yeares olde, and was a pleader in the Court: tvvas no reſpect of reuerence to his father (for hee was departed out of the vvorlde:) twas not that his reſolution was ſomwhat ſtaggered by the remembrance of his olde friends and fellows, for he more regarded *Baſile* then them all? how then, where was the impediment? it was obſeruance to his poore mother: for when ſhe ſet vpon me with this ſpeach, O ſon I was a freſh young beautifull widdow, when I refuſed the profers of a ſecond mariage, therby to enable my ſelfe to doe thee the more good, and then (alas poor childe) when thou waſt a ſmall infant, all my care was, that thou mighteſt haue plentifull meanes for thy education and preferment; And now in liew of all theſe my kindneſſes, in ſtead of al thoſe thãks and comforts which ſo many benefits might challenge from thee, canſt thou finde in thy heart to forſake me now? ro contemn and diſdaine me now? make mee twice a widdow? and waken my time of mourning which vvas novv laide aſleepe? why tell me (good ſonne) didſt thou euer lacke any thing that I could helpe thee to? did I euer vvrong thee in al my life? If thou wilt needes enter into a monaſte-

rie,

rie, vvhy firſt ſee me honeſtlie buried in my graue? Hearke: doſt thou not hear the voice of the Lord crying aloud [ſonne honour thy mother *Authuſam.*] Surely he performes faire obedience to Gods commandements, that by ſuch demeanour grieues his mother: O ſonne hadſt thou done for mee all that poſſibly a ſonne can doe for his mother, yet haſt thou payd me nothing for my manifold ſorrowes, for my throbs in childbed, which for thy deere ſake I ſo patiently endured, for my paines in bearing thee, for the ſuſtenance which I gaue thee, when I ſtroaked my breſts into thy lippes, with the true affection of a moſt naturall mother? What haue I for my hunger and faſting which I ſuſtained for thee, when I refrained to eat any thing that might hurt thee, and drinke anie thing that might marre my milke. If I kept faſt, it was for thee, if I did eate, it was for thee, If I refuſed any meat, it was for thee, if I accepted of any meat it was for thee, and many a night I haue watched for thee, and manie a bitter teare haue I ſhed for thee, and doeſt thou now vtterlie forſake me? I could hould out no longer (ſaith he) but forthvvith yeelded, as being ſtrongly ouercome with a reuerent reſpect to ſo good a mother. And thereupon he makes his excuſe to *Baſilius*, and in deſpite of al theſe arguments which

(which haue bene forceably bent and diſcharged againſt thee) choſe rather to continue with his mother, than to abide in a monaſtery. He himſelfe writing afterwards to *Baſilius*, vſeth theſe words: I confeſſe I haue broken my promiſe, for vvhen I left Athens, & ſuch familiar acquaintance as I had in that vniuerſity, my purpoſe vvas to haue addicted my ſelfe vvholly to your companie, and vvith you to haue ſpent my daies in contemplation. But I haue broken my worde and that not vpon anie wilfull diſpoſition (I would haue you ſo to vnderſtand mee) but, for that one law hath more preuailed with me than another, I meane that law which requires dutifull obedience vnto parents, more than the ſociable Law of friendſhip and good fellowſhip. Now parallell thy ſelfe with S. *Chryſoſtome*. When thou waſt yet in thy nonage, all thy contriuing was, how to be a Ieſuite; fatherles, I am ſure thou waſt not, except thou wilt ſay thou wert fatherleſſe in this ſence, that thou hadſt a Father, but ſuch a one as thou didſt not care for: nor motherleſſe, for, that thou hadſt a moſt kinde and louing gentlewoman to thy mother. How was it then? that neither thy fathers authoritie, nor thy mothers tender loue and affection might ought preuaile with thee in not attempting anie thing without

without their approbation and aduice. Thou haſt ſhunned their preſence, wandred vp and downe the worlde like a vagabond, and for three whole yeeres together concealed thy ſelfe, after ſuch a manner of inſolent indignity and arrogancie, that in all that long time, thou haſt neither vouchſafed to write me one letter, nor ſend me ſo much as one word how I might know to find thee out, either in France, Lorryne, or Spaine. Perhaps, you ſtood in ſome feare that your Mother *Hortenſia* ſhould affront you with ſuch an encounter as this. Why ſon, if God ſhould haue called away thy Father (which I hope neuer to ſee) what ſtay ſhould I haue found in the worlde after him? Thy brethren, alas poore ſoules they be too young. And what hope could I haue had from them, that haue thee for a patterne of diſobedience? No doubt God is much bound vnto you for your good ſeruice done vnto him, that in a iealous compariſon thereof, cannot endure any commerce or correſpondency with your parents? no not ſo much as for the returne of a few letters? If this you haue done vpon ſome nice conceit, that they reſpect you too too neere, becauſe you are of their bloud, and alliance, yet remember withall they bee good Chriſtian folke, not pagans, and that this tender affection of theirs proceeds rather from

from a feare of thy well doing, than from any doubt which they can possibly make of the articles of their Christian faith and religion. It was not without good cause (I perceiue now) that good *Veturia* refused vtterly to be employed in embassage to *Martius Coriolanus* hir sonne. For what saith she, shall I get at his hands? what shall all my little nephewes get, when he that hath liued in banishment for 4. yeares together, in all that while neuer sent me so much as one letter? hath quite forgotten his kindred, as well as his natiue countrey, which (might I speake like a mother) most vncurteously and vndeseruedly condemned him. Shee notwithanding all this, embarkt her selfe in the message, and forced him to come in, by no other stratagem of war than the name of a mother. What thinkest thou? art thou more religious than S. *Chrysostome*, more hard harted than was *Coriolanus*? yet he came to meete his mother halfe way, thou flyest from thine, and eschewest her very presence. What? feareſt thou to write vnto me? in Gods name write, write without date of day or year. Indeed if S. *Basil* be your countenance for this irreligious deuotion, the imputation were the lesse, and the fault more excusable on you part, I must needs grant.

But (I feare me) that we haue little aduantaged

taged our cauſe all this while by quoting of ſo many ancient Fathers, except it be, the filling vp of a long empty catalogue with names. Our beſt way therefore in my iudgement to deale with thee, will be with ſome records and precedents of antiquity. And whereas S. *Chryſoſtome* hath written ſome bookes, againſt ſuch as diſcommend the monaſticall life, & hath giuen counſell to parents to take ſome care that their children bee trained vp in ſuch ſpeculatiõs, rather then to make them ſwordmen or of the long robe, his intent is therby in preferring that kinde of life before any other, to aduize men rather to beſtow their children in a courſe of religion, than a ſecular employment; but not to make them in any ſort diſobedient to their friends, and in deſpite of them to abandon cities, and inhabite vaſt mountainous deſerts, nay hee wills them after ſome time ſpent, after they haue bene well ſeaſoned in Chriſtianity, to repayre home againe to their parents. Which makes mee to thinke that the Monkes of that world, were not termers for life in their monaſtery, as now they vſe to be, but at libertie to return home when they liſt. Againe reade the ſame S. *Chryſoſtome* in his bookes *de prouidentia*, there you ſhall obſerue how hee ſpends himſelfe in comforting *Stagyrius* the Monke, who was therefore vexed

vexed with a deuill, because that contrary to the aduice of his Father, he had cast himselfe into a cloyster, and whom for that cause, he terms an *intruding Frier*. But *Stagyrius* was the of ripe yeares and his father had not expresly forbid him that calling, onely hee counselled him otherwise. S. *Austine* himselfe and S. *Ambrose* in his first booke, *De Virginibus*, towards the end, proues that parents should not hinder a daughter from consecrating her selfe to the seruice of the Church, but yet withall so, that a Father may (if his pleasure bee) peremptorily to forbid it. And doth not Saint *Austin* in his 109 and 110. epistle to *Ecdicia* plainely say, that shee had made a deede of gift of her sonne in her life time, whereby to kill him, in that his father was not first made acquainted therewith, what course of life vpon more maturitie and discretion hee afterwards might follow, to bee either a Monke Priest, or a married man: therefore till he came to such an age, his fathers voice and consent was absolutelie necessarie thereunto: but the conclusion of all is, that the son born in lawfull and holie Wedlocke is more to be in subiection to the Father than to the mother. And therefore he cannot be denied him whersoeuer he be, when once hee is lawfully demanded. The same Father in his 233. E

pistle

piſtle to *Benenatus*, doth not he write of a certaine girle, that as the report went, would faine haue beene a Nunne, how hee conſulted about the matter with *Felix* her Aunts Huſband, and that otherwiſe he neither could nor would haue giuen way vnto it. What would his opinion haue beene (thinke you) of hir mother, whoſe direction and will in beſtowing of hir daughter, was euer to bee preferred before all others? Without doubt, if the mothers intereſt be ſo much, the fathers is a great deale more, and ſo great as he would not haue much demurred, whether the ſonne were vnder yeares or aboue, for ſuch a queſtion would neuer haue beene propoſed. Laſtly, I appeale to thy conſcience (good Father *Saluianus*) waſt thou a ſtranger to this newe Church diſcipline, when thou tookeſt ſuch extraordinary paines to *Hesarius* and *Quieta*, that they would pleaſe to excuſe that action of their daughter *Palladia*, for that ſhee was conuerted from Paganiſme to Chriſtianitye, without their priuity? do I ſay her action? nay to excuſe thine owne, that after the birth of thy daughter *Auſpiciola*, refrainedſt the companie of thine owne wife, the better to giue thy ſelfe to faſting and prayer, hauing no warrant ſo to doe from thy father in laws permiſſion. When they betrothed *Palladia* to

thee, they gaue her to a Christian husband, and thereby sufficiently expresst their consent that she likewise for hir behalf should become a Christian. Yea and certaine it is, that a little after this blessed match, thy wiues parents that so dearely affected their daughter, became Christians also. Howsoeuer then they might haue taken it ill at thy hands, that vndertookest this without their speciall leaue, (for what hope could they conceiue of any grand-child to be borne vnder that marriage, where the man and wife liued a part?) what reproache was it vnto them, that in a matter of such weighty importance they should not be worthie so much as to be lookt after? If they for such an insignious contempt done vnto them should haue said vnto thee, Sirra, packe out of our sight, and write letters vpon letters as long as thou list, and it bee seauen yeares together thou shalt receiue not one line from vs in way of answer, (and yet I must haue tolde you that *Palladia* now after the enter-marriage, belonged not to hir Father but to hir husbands disposition) couldst thou in defence of thy selfe haue said, that it was a point of feruent zeale to Godwards, first to hate and set at naught thy Father? Oh, but reade his epistles, and reade them ouer, thou wilt tell me another tale: there is nothing but bitter teares, pitti-

full

full fuites: and begging pardons, although faith he, for my part, I do not well know how, or wherin I haue offended them. Now vppon theſe premiſes, ſee how I could conclude againſt thee: I haue writte many letters to thee, but neuer receiued any one for anſwere backe again. Thou art not yet come to yeers of diſcretion, thou haſt entred into a vow, (I wil not ſay of chaſtitie but of ſingle life,) and neuer told me of it. Poore ſoule, how couldeſt thou make any vow at that yeares? thou canſt not defend thy ſelfe and ſay, why but Father, I had your conſent, though you did not openly expreſſe it. For thou knoweſt vvell enough that I did mainely withſtand it: in a worde whereas thou haſt reuolted to the Ieſuites companie, tis not paganiſme that thou haſt forſaken: but the holy fellowſhip and Communion of thy Chriſtian brethren. Why then doſt thou not vpon thy bare knees aske me forgiuenes, thou haſt more reaſon ſo to doe, ſonne, than euer *Saluianus* had: for hee in humility acknowledged his offence, but thou canſt not be brought to confeſſe thine. Now I pray thee, ſonne, bethink thy ſelfe how greeuously this holy man would haue bene affrighted with the remorſe of his diſobedience, if hee had offered ſuch wrong, I will not ſay to Idolatrous parents, ſuch as they vvere, but to beleeuing, whereas

his master, for this cause only, that they differ in religion. Sir it is not your Friars cowle, nor Monks habit, nor ancient order of knighthood, that ye can enter into, shall euer be able to raze or blot out, that fast tie and obligation, which in this case, God and men haue interchangeablie sealed and deliuered the one to the other. It is a fashion well becomming Barbarians and heretiques (so saith Bishop *Victor* in his first booke *De persecutione Vandalica*) to separate husbands from their wiues, or children from their parents. And when *Valentinian* the Emperor like a most glorious Prince, had authorised the profession of Christian religion, and the citie of *Carthage*, whence by reason of *Arrianisme* it was for a season exiled, the first worke that the Bishop did, was, that al mariages should hold though the parties were of different religion, and parents should haue their children againe, that the Arrians had forceably taken from them.

So then to begin our relation with the story of a slaue, If he would fall off from his master because he was a Gentile or a Iew, might not the fauour of libertie, but especiallie of religion, plead his excuse? the Canons, which bee tearmed the Canons of the Apostles, flatlie say no. *If seruants bee promoted to holie orders without their masters consent, ipso facto, their*

masters

masters may challenge them backe againe for slaues. (it is to be found in the 81. Chapter. But if any person of seruile condition be worthie the degree of holy orders (as was *Onesimus* and the master yeeld thereunto) after they be enfranchised and made free men, it may bee done. The Councell of Gangrene which was held An. 324. and somewhat after the *Nicene*, forbids it likewise, saying: Let him be accursed whosoeuer he be that shall seduce another mans seruant to be vndutifull to his master vnder colour or occasion of his religion, and doth not rather teach him to serue him with an honest heart and all due obseruance, that so he may be a free man of Christ, (as *Ignatius* supplies it) let him be accursed. Certaine it is, that this is to be ment of the slaues of hethen, and the religion there mentioned is to be intended of the Christian. But in the Councell held at *Orleance* vnder King *Childebert*, there is a great deale more: for ouer and besides that it disauowes the voluntary oblation of a slaue to the seruice of the Church, without his masters knowledge, it laies a penalty vpon the Bishop that so admits him: to wit, that in six months after, he is not to celebrate. *Iustinian* in his 123. nouell Constitution, apointed a certaine time, wherin the master was to recouer his slaue from the Church,

but

but *Leo* the 9 made an act, that the challenge should still hold and be perpetuall. Yea but if you say the case is altered, in a Monk, for his estate being regular, is more to be priuiledged than a secular priest. *Charlemaine* (as it should appeare by a certaine constitution of his) is of a contrarie opinion. Let no man, saith he, entice another mans slaue, to become a Priest or a Monk, without leaue and license of his master (you may read the Act in the 20. and 27. Chapter. The primitiue Church obserued as much, not that she thought God was any way dishonored by the ministerie of a poore slaue, (for with God all men are alike) how then? *Tertullian* against the heretique *Martion* will giue you the reason. Saith he, what action is there more vniust, wrongfull, and wicked, than so to demerit my seruant, with your kindnes, as that neuer afterwards he shal liue to doe me any more seruice? another man shall lay claime to him, and let me haue any suit in law, he shall produce him for a witnes against me, and that (which of all bad is the worst) euen then, and at that time, whilst he liues in my house with me, liues vpon my allowance, trembles and quakes vnder the stripes of my rod. A wise man should bee as sparing to do another mans wife, his slaue, free man, or any vnder his charge, any curtesie

teſie extraordinarie, as to procure them any harme. For a man cannot poſſiblie inueagle or allureanie of them, but withall of neceſſitie he muſt bereaue them particularlie of that loue and truth which in conſcience the wife ſhould beare to her husband, the ſlaue to his maſter, the freeman to his patron, and laſtlie the ſubiect to his ſoueraigne. And no doubt by Gods grace, but he that liues in ſubiection to anothor mans rules, in that courſe of obedience, may be partaker of eternall bliſſe: whereas he that ſpurnes and murmurs in that he is called to be a ſeruant, ſhould I ſay, diuorceth himſelfe from the religion & faith of Chriſt, nay malicioullie reneges it, which conſiſts wholliе in loue and obedience, excepe there be ſom ſuch action inioined, which is directlie oppoſite to piete. And ſo writes S. *Chryſoſtome* in his 35 homilie vpon thoſe words of S. *Paul*, *Children obey your parents in all things.*

Now concerning wiues (for that is our next paſſage) ye find it thus decreed, *Let neither Biſhop, Prieſt or Deacon, put away his wife, vnder colour of religion: if he doe, let him be excommunicated, and if he ſo continue, let him be degraded.* The ſame Canon is thus tranſcribed into *Gratians* decree, at the 28. diſtinction, whoſoeuer ſhall teach that a Prieſt vpon pretence

of

of religion, may refuse his wife, let him be accursed. And the Fathers assembled in the Councell of *Gangrene* publishe this decree, that whosoeuer should put a difference betweene a married or vnmarried Priest, as though his mariage disabled him from administring the holy communion, and for that cause refuseth to communicate with him, let him be accursed. And a little after: Whosoeuer shall condemne mariage, or thinke that a faithfull deuout woman, cohabiting with her husband, is therefore iudicially to bee indited, as if, forsooth, the married couple could not possiblie enter into the kingdome of heauen, let him bee accursed. What canst thou say for thy selfe to the contrary? dost thou not find by those lawes, that as well she is to be reputed for an excommunicate person, which vpon pretence of liuing continent, liues a part from her husband, and refraines his bed, as they, which stand so highly vpon commendation of chastitie, (and because they would be tearmed abstinent,) do vilifie and disgrace the holy estate of wedlocke?

Now concerning parents and children, their obligation, as well as their relation, is mutuall. Therefore the Synod saith thus much first of parents: Whosoeuer shall forsake

ſake his own children, & ſhal not bring them vp, as it is the part of a father, and giue them not things neceſſary, but vnder pretence of liuing continentlie, thinke they may be forlorn: let him be accurſed. Son, thou neuer foundeſt me yet defectiue in any one point, that a kind father ſhould doe for his child, which if I had I muſt haue been extreamlie negligent, and ſo reputed in the iudgement of *Ptolomie*. I haue maintained, cheriſht, and taught thee: for Greek and Latin, I dare be bold to ſay, thou haſt been inſtructed, ſo far foorth, as was fitting for a yong gentleman. Thy good vncle *Monſieur Iames Erodius* the preſident, and my ſelfe, haue made it our eager contention (as indeed we exceed both in our loue and affection toward thee) that thou ſhouldſt faile of nothing that might be any way deuiſed meet for any excellent purpoſe, that ſo finding the courſe whereunto thou waſt moſt inclined, we might in time accordingly diſpoſe of thee, (which *Nazianzene* ſaith was the faſhion among the Athenians) or that thou mightſt diſpoſe of thy ſelfe, in caſe we were dead before, and thou come to full age. And haue we this faire recompence for all our loue and kindneſſe to be forſaken by thee now, & not thought good enough to be ſpoken vnto at thy departure. It is reported in *Sa*

Hieromes

Hieromes Epistles, that the holy matron *Paula* left both towne and children, excepting only her yong daughter *Eustochia*, whom she took in her companie with her to *Bethleem*, vpon a resolution there to liue retired. But I must tell you, all these children (beside *Toxotius*) were come to yeers, and he was not left vnprouided neither, for the mother made him, and his sister *Rufina*, that was mariageable, her sole executors, and gaue them all that she had, and appointed them guardians to oouersee them. And the like story you may read in *Paulinus* in his 10. Epistle to *Severus*, how he commends exceedinglie the holy woman *Melania*, that hauing buried her husband, and being the mother of one little boy, left him behind her, sailde to Ierusalem, and there betooke her selfe to a life of more perfection. But she left him (which likewise would be obserued,) exceeding rich, she left him kin, and allied to all the great men of *Rome*.

But now that I may haue a saying to thee, come on sir, stand neere, and hearken to the doome which shall be pronounced against thee, and bethinke thy selfe, who shall giue thee absolution from the curse of the foresaid Synod, whereunto without doubt thou art notoriouslie liable. If any forme (saith the 16. Canon) shall forsake their parents, especiallie

ciallie ſuch as are beleeuers, taking occaſion by pretence of religion, and ſhall not yeelde them more dutie and reuerence in that reſpect, let them be accurſed. Now I pray thee, tell me trulie did they conceale this Councel from thee? I verilie beleeue they did. I cannot be perſwaded that thy iudgement is ſo erroneous, as to imagine that a ſonne may doe more againſt his father, than a ſlaue againſt his maſter: as to imagine that it were a grieuous ſinne for a father (not to prouide for his children) and but a peccadilio in a ſonne to ſtand out vndutifull, deſpitefull, and contemptuous againſt his parents. See, the Councell makes noe diſtinction of beleeuing parents or vnbeleeuing, of childrens minority or their ful age. But peraduenture, they vvill priuily whiſper, and tell thee that this Councel vvas but to hold for a time, not to continue. To this I anſwere, that the reuerend fathers of the Church, for a long time after, approued that Synode, as you may find it recorded in the fifth generall Councell of Conſtantinople, and ſo did *Gratian* alſo in his Decrees: for to what purpoſe elſe did hee incorporate it among them? Laſtlie, that anſvvere might ſtand for good, if the Councell of Gangrene had intended their Canon againſt deſertion of heathen parents onely: for where-

vvhereas Gentiliſme vvas then in more requeſt and ſway than Chriſtianity, the greater care was to be taken for it, that they ſhould not loath our Chriſtiã religion too much (as poſſibly they would) and not vnlike, but at that time, the Church might directly inhibite the beleeuing man to forſake his vnbeleeuing wife, vnleſſe in point of violence forced to paganiſme and Idolatry. But ſure it is; that the Councells meaning neuer was that Children ſhould forſake their parents, becauſe they were Chriſtians, for it ſaith in expreſſe words: [Let children reuerence their parents, if for no other ende, yet for this, becauſe they are Chriſtians], a reaſon (as I conceiue) that will euer holde for Chriſtians: for *Vigorius*, a writer of our time, cites the ſame Synode to this very purpoſe. But it will not bee amiſſe in my opinion, to ſet downe the cauſe and occaſion of the ſummoning of this Synode. It was not becauſe Pagan parents did make it their complaint of grieuance, that their children did abandon and forſake them, the cauſe was clean contrarie; which was, that they which were Chriſtians left them which were of their owne profeſſion, and religion, malapert and ſawcie ſonnes did treſpaſſe ſo againſt their parents, as thou haſt lately done againſt mee: marry, the difference if any bee, is this, that they

they in former time, affected a true monaſtical retired life, and thou according to the fashion of the time, doſt affect a profeſſiō barelie conſiſting in an habit of apparell, and formalitie of words: they crucified the worlde to the fleſh, and the fleſh to the vvorlde, but men of your coate ſaue halfe the labour; and crucifie the world onlie. From whence then comes ſuch a corruption in this diſcipline? I will tell you. About the time that ſome newe fangled fellowes ſprung vp in the Church, and termed themſelues Anchorites, Eremites or Monkes, there ſteps me vp one *Euſtatius*, who led by an inconſiderate zeale, began whereſoeuer hee came, to thunder out thoſe glorious magnificent words written in the Goſpell, [that they were vnworthy of Chriſt, that loued Father or mother more than Chriſt,] and thereupon to inferre that all things in the world are to bee contemned and ſet at naught: as houſe, poſſeſſions, parents, children, brethren, yea (and to make ſhort worke,) all the vniuerſal world, the better to liue in ſome ſolitary hermitage, vnder ſome rule, and in ſome company ſeuered and ſhut from all men. And why ſo thinke you? becauſe it was nothing worth to bee a Chriſtian, except you had bene alſo of the order of *Euſtatius*. But what was the iſſue of this Doctrine? Sir this, that the wife wold leaue her husband

husband, and he his wife: the seruant his ma-
ster, and he his seruant: the parents their chil-
dren, and they their parents: that Chri-
stians set light by marriage, and all duty else,
which euery man owes vnto his countrie: that
religion, which was wont to keepe all in good
order, was now become ringleader to all con-
fusion and disorder. Lastly, that the Gentiles
might well say (and *Zozimus* by name) *That*
Christians be barren & vnfruitfull in all affairs of
dutie, which is a speech that *Tertullian* in his a-
pologeticus, holds *to be the most disgracefull &*
scandalous that euer yet was vttered against Chri-
stians. But the sectaries of *Eustatius* reioynde,
why but this desertion is, because wee would
bee the freer for the seruice of God. But the
Fathers assembled in Councell, condemne
this faire occasion, and prooued full & whole
that it was an act far more Christianlike and
Religious, to worship and loue our parents
(for that is the commandement of God) than
so to serue God, as thereby to despise the pa-
rents, a thing which he vtterly forbids. For
God and parents may well bee honoured to-
gether, but no man liuing can truely worship
God without he honor his parents also. Then
upon this new founder *Eustatius*, shortly af-
ter changed his copy, and came to be a Bishop
in the Church, and not a cloisterer. And than
this

this was the true occaſion of aſſembling that Councell the very letter of that Councell, as alſo *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Iſidor* and *Gratian* in his 16. and 30. *Diſtinct.* doe apparantly teſtifie. How now ſir? Will ſo many and ſo waighty authorities do no good with you? for (I thank you) you haue beene bold to ſet my authority at naught? or are you eftſoones perſwaded, that ſhould I affoord my conſent neuer ſo much, you could not yet bee a true and abſolute Ieſuite? peraduenture you are yet ſomwhat grauelled in this doubt? ſo then let vs take ſome view of that which they alleadge vnto you out of S. *Hierome*, and withall conſider, whether there be any cloyſter Diuinity, or new found Goſpel lately ſprung vp among them, to repeale theſe auncient Canons and decrees of the Church, which you in your braue ruffe doe ſo lightly eſteeme of. It may not be denied, but that S. *Hierome* writing to *Heliodorus* in commendation of a ſolitary life, vſeth theſe words [ſhould thy little nephewe hang faſt claſping about thy neck: & thy mother with her treſſes diſheueled about her ears renting & tearing her garmēts, diſcouer thoſe paps which gaue thee ſucke: ſhould thy father that begate thee lie downe before thee in the way: paſſe ouer thy father, and trample him vnder thy feete, ſhed not a teare, but with an

heroicall resolution, flye towring vp in high speed to the standard of thy Sauiours crosse. Sauage cruelty in such a case is your onely pitie. Doubtlesse, heere is a right noble sentence and well becomming the high spirit of so excellent a Father in the Church: but before I cleare the point, & shew in what meaning this was spoken, wherein S. *Hierome* (as it should seeme by this) makes such cheape reputation of parents authority, and in so doing dishonours the chastity of all naturall kindnes: I would faine see that passage in him, concerning parents obedience, (it is in his Epistle *de vitando suspecto contubernio*) reconciled to this. There you shall reade him thus, Father and Mother, saith he, are names of dutie, wordes of respect, bonds of nature, and vnder God, the second truce and league of our loue. It is none of your commendation to say you loue them not, it is a notorious sinne in you, if you hate them. Our Lord and Sauior Iesus Christ was subiect to his parents. He reuerenced that mother to whom hee was father, loued that nurce, whom he fostered, and forgot not that wombe where hee was conceiued, nor those armes that so oft bore him. You will perhaps replie and say, but heere lies the exception, when a sonne liuing vnder the gouernment of his Father is once resolutely determined to goe

goe into a monaſterie, why then hee may bee bolde to forbeare all ſhew of dutie, and paſſe neither for good nature nor good manners. Then crueltie in that caſe may be interpreted mercie; inciuilitie, good conditions; contempt obedience. But thinke not (good ſon) though S. *Hierome* vſed ſuch a faire colourable ſpeech to *Heliodorus* that if hee ſhould haue dealt in earneſt with him, he would haue aduiſed him, to ben ſo behaued, as his words doe implye. God forbid that S. *Hierome* ſhould euer be taken for principall or acceſſory in parricide: that for the ſame verie cauſe that *Æneas* was ſurnamed the *pious* (as *Virgil* in all places ſtiles him)

Amids the ſcorching flames, and thouſand ſhot of darts
I reſcued mine aged Syre, and made theſe ſhoulders bowe
To garde him from the enemies troope.

For an action directly contrarie, a Chriſtian man ſhould goe about to merit, the ſame ſurname & appellation: or that S. *Hierome* by any meanes, ſhould rather propoſe wicked *Tullia* for an inſtance of pietie, that roade in her coach ouer her fathers coarſe, than deuout *Æneas*, for an imitation to *Heliodorus*. Yea though hee might purchaſe thereby all the kingdomes and ſeignories of the world, or all the vaſt territories of hell, where ghoſtes Lorde it, as *Painims* ſuppoſe: or laſtly, that

who ſo profeſt himſelfe a Monke in ſuch a ſcornefull faſhion to his parents, ſhould bee better thought of than *Cleobis* and *Biton*, that drewe their aged mother in a litter, (to a place where ſhe was to ſacrifice) in ſtead of a payre of coatch-horſes. Or thoſe brethren, which for they reſcued their impotent parents, from the rage of a tempeſtuos fire, the people of Catanna, in a reuerence of their deuotion, called by no other name than the *godlie children*. Certainely it is ſo far from S. *Hieromes* meaning to haue his words peruerted & drawn to the maintenance of ſuch a barbarous cruelty and impity, as that when hee ſpake this to *Heliodorus*, neither his Father or mother were then liuing: ſo that the inference is impoſſible that had his Father & mother forbad him to haue beene an Eremite in the wildernes of Syria, he would haue gone ouer them, and ſtamped them vnder his feete. What then may S. *Hieromes* meaning be? why this: After *Heliodorus* had long time beene a ſouldier in the wars, and dealt much in negotiating of ſtate matters, growing into ſome yeares, and hauing no iſſue, (as we tolde you before) he bad farewell to the world, and in S. *Hieromes* company which was his puyſne, vowed a ſolitary and retyred life, and to that end they both entred into a monaſtery, liued there long time together

ther, at laſt *Heliodorus* had a great longing to ſee how his onely ſiſter, and hir young ſonne did: and there (lo) did he alter his former reſolution, for there he betakes himſelfe to the Church, and in ſtead of being a Monke, becomes a Cleargy man. This was the time without all peraduenture, when S. *Hierome* wrought theſe matters in commendation of the monaſticall life, beeing for yeares but a ſtripling, and almoſt a very boy, (as he ſpeaks of himſelfe in another place,) and comming freſh from the vniuerſity, then he vſeth theſe flouriſhing ſpeeches vnto him, alluding from his ſecular to the heauenly warfare, interlacing withall ſuch ſtrong motiues, and perſwaſions as friends vſe often to their friends, all to this purpoſe in effect, that wheras we are commanded to be *Eunuches* for Chriſts ſake, to pul the verie eies out of our head if they offend, to leaue and forſake all that we haue in this preſent worlde, as if the caſe were deſperate for a rich man euer to come to heauen, (a point whereof S. *Auſten* diſcourſes excellently in his 89. epiſtle to *Hilarius*) not to be carefull for to morrow, to turne thy left cheeke to him that ſmites thee on the right, and many moe ſayings of the like nature, which were they literally vnderſtood and not ſpiritually, without queſtion, would fill the Church full with he-

resies, and yet concerning worldlie wealth doth not *S. Austen* in an Epistle to *Bonifacius* tell vs, a valiant Christian minded man should not be puft vp if he haue it, nor be deiected if he loose it? was not *Leontius* a Bishop of *Laodicea*, condemned of the Church for dismembring himselfe? whereupon *Anastasius* a Bishop of *Nice* in his 73. and 79 question saith, what is meant by this Gospell, *(if thy right eie offend thee, or thy right hand, cut it off from thee)* Christ meant it not of our bodilie parts and members, (God forbid) but of our friends, and kinsfolke, for hee slanders Gods workmanship, that dismembers himselfe? And euen *S. Hierome* himselfe, hath he not written so manie things in that straine of vehemencie for commendation of virginitie and single life, that he seems in a manner to disallow and condemne all mariage? yet questionles he neuer meant it. For were it so that he spake as he thought, and perswaded *Heliodorus* rather to make his way ouer his fathers body, than to forsake that blissefull estate (which as it seems in your conceipt) the cloister affoords, why then would he prefer Priesthood before it? indeed he confesseth that *Heliodorus* answer, may serue any other mans turne else, but cannot serue his owne, who hauing professt in precise tearmes, the

actiue

actiue life, might not without blame, renoūce his former profeſſion, and betake himſelfe to an order of higher perfection, as namely Prieſthood. Indead he deſcribes the good and happie eſtate of them that liue in monaſteries, and likewiſe how perilous and ſubiect to all manner of temptations, their condition is, that liue at large in the world and ſaith he was a glad man, to ſee him come vp ſo high, but very fearefull to thinke of his fall. So that he blames not *Heliodorus*, for leauing his cloiſter, nor his entrings into Prieſthood, nay he perſwades him not directly, to forſake the one, and returne to the other. But becauſe firſt he reuolted from being a ſouldier, to become a Monke, and afterwards grew wearie of his cowle, abiuring the profeſſion which he vndertook in *S. Ieromes* company, his endeauour is now by theſe forceable reaſons, or rather rhetorique ſchemes and colours, to draw him backe againe into his monaſterie. And as for theſe words of the Goſpell *(he that loueth father or mother more than me)* I pray marke whether *Heliodorus* anſwered *S. Hierom* well, that they were to be vnderſtood in caſe of martyrdome, or whether *S. Hieromes* reply to this anſwer, be ſufficient. But be it as it may be, that no man ſhould ſtand too ſtiffelie vpon the authoritie of that ſpeech, which is

not altogether so true, as neat and elegant, obseruing more his words, than his meaning, for an vpshopt of all, when he came to riper yeeres, he recants that opinion, in an epistle written to *Nepotian*, who by this time also, was both in yeers and discretion grown to be a man. And as concerning such arguments, as he had proposed to *Heliodorus*, he saith he did it as a yong man, after the fashion of the schooles, when the fire of his study and learning in Rhetorique was not clean beat out of him for verily at that time, a man might freely enter into a monasterie, and when him list leaue him. And then the question was idle, whether a man might follow this course of life, without his parents liking, because then there was no such obligation by vowes as now a daies there is, and had a man misliked of his profession, his punishment was none other but the imputation of lightnesse and inconstancie, which is euident out of *S. Austins* epistle to his friend *Bonface*. The profession of being a Monke in those daies was nothing else but the meditation, and exercise of the ancient, free, and trulie christian manner of liuing. And therefore in this pretence they might with much more honestie loose themselues from their kindered, and alliance. So then let no man father it vpon *S. Hierome*,

vvhich

which makes nothing for his purpoſe. Indeed he went about to ſolicite ſome of his fellows, to enter into this kind of life with him, but euerie one liked it not, and among others *Pammachius* that was his chiefeſt friend, had leaſt fancie vnto it. For his deſire was rather to liue married than to be tied to ſuch ſtrict rules of religion. Onlie *Bonoſius* followed him, and profeſt himſelfe a Monke, not paſſing for mother, brother, or ſiſters, yet ſtill reſpecting his father. Nay euen S. *Hierome* himſelfe, after he had been an Hermite for ſome time, returned backe againe to *Rome*. S. *Auſtin* indeed in his 76. Epiſtle, is not throughlie reſolued in this point, whether a Monke forſaking his cel, might afterwards be in holy orders. Therfore bethinke now with thy ſelfe, and conſider it well, whether that aſſertion of S. *Hieromes* can be thy iuſt excuſe, I ſay whether it can be any iuſt excuſe, for thee that art not yet fiue and twentie yeers of age, that haſt a father and mother yet liuing, that neuer madeſt any vow to the Ieſuits before hand, that art not hereupon either to renege Paganiſme, or to ſecure thy ſelfe from perſecution, or to wander into vaſt and vncouth wildernesſes, and there to continue, but to be entertained into as delicate and pleaſant places and cities, as the worlds yeeld any, that haſt an abbie for

thy

thy prison, and a good town for thy paradise. But make of S. *Hieromes* speech what can be made, make him of what age thou wilt, when he wrote this Epistle, if notwithstanding all this, the name of such a great workmã so deeplie with you, why may you not for your satisfaction herein parralell *Heliodorus* example with him? why not the example of *Letus* (especiallie if that be S. *Austins* epistle which is written vnto him:) who hauing vowed a religious life, and that not in his minoritie but at mans estate, vpon the sole discontent and griefe which he conceiued afterwards, because he had neglected the dutie to his mother, in not making her acquainted with this vow, returned fairelie home againe to his countrie, which before in the hot zeale he bare to a religious life, he had abandoned. Why may you not oppose S. *Iohn Chrysostomes* example. these men were neuer for all this, either the lesse holie, or worse Christians, most certaine it is there is nothing can be a bar to a godlie life. You may not plead pretence that you are maried, that you are a father of children, that you are a souldier, a merchant, an artificer, a seruant, a rich man, a begger, (for so speakes S. *Chrysostome* in a certaine mariage sermon.) I tell you one that dwells in the Citie, may com very neer to a Monks deuotion, & a maried

ried man, that liues at home, may say his prayers, and fast, and be penitent for his sinnes, as the same Father also affirmes in another place. Now that you may not thwart me, and say, that such precedents were proper onlie for the primitiue Church; and that the comparison stood then betwixt gentilisme and Christianity, betwixt a religious life in a cloister, and an vpright godlie life abroad in the world, when this controuersie was treated of. I will produce you that verie age wherein S. *Bernard* liued, and last lie to leaue you without all scruple of doubt, I will answer an obiection, which is made out of the Emperor *Iustinians* constitution, which in some mens conceipt, is verie strong for the libertie of children, in dedicating themselues to the seruice of the Church, without their parents leaue, to the intent, that hauing throughlie considered what can bee alleadged of both sides, thou thy selfe mayst be iudge, and pronounce the sentẽce, whether this fact of thine which thou hast thus committed against me, be to be termed a fact of honest behauiour, or cõtrariwise altogether of vnrespectiue demeanour. Here then the question consists generallie betweene Catholiques, nay in a far more narrow compasse, than Catholiques, it consists between monkes: that holie Abbot had

had a nephew whose name was *Robert*, his father purposed to make him a Monke of the order of *Cluniacenses*, but he dying before his sonne was tendred, *Robert* profest himself a *Cisterian* Monke, and S. *Bernard* himselfe adopted him thereunto. Soone after this, certaine Monkes of the order of *Cluniacenses*, seduced the poore youth, and drew him from that Abbie to their owne. Heare then began the brige between the two regulars. S. *Bernard* was the first man that accused this their fact, and said it was done by meer seducement and enueagling of the youth, in that they had vsed fraude, flatterie, and craftie conueiance, to effect this their purpose. For they that should seduce his nephew, first attempted it by a nouice of their order, after that by a Monke that was better able, lastlie by one of their greatest Priors, amongst them. Then hee laid to their charge, forceable intrusion, in that they had hurt the porters of the Cel, and so rescued yong *Robert* out of his cloister, as if they would haue broken a Gaile. Without acquainting either the superior of the order withall, or the Abbot, or his vncle S. *Bernard*, now I pray thee tel me whether thy case and this be all one, first, because one that was penitentiarie and Confessor there, buzd this into thine eare, and after him, another that was

was maſter of the chamber, came and told thee that there was no eſtate of men ſo bleſſed, as the Regular was, and laſtlie the prouinciall of the order came, & ſaid, that among al the regular, there was none comparable with your ſociety, as beeing called after the name of Ieſus: but marke what S. *Bernard* alleages, and that will ſufficientlie refute and condemn your ſo highly magnified vocation and inſpiration: there was no ſuite (ſaith hee) made for his admiſſion by his parents, which the rule expreſſely enioyneth.) as though hee ſhould haue ſaid, albeit his Father when he was aliue did much wiſh to haue his ſonne of the order of Cluniacenſis, but being preuented by death neuer liued to ſee his deſire fulfilled, and the common rule expreſly requires, that he that will enter into a monaſterie, muſt bee offered vnto it firſt, by his parents, in the view and preſence of ſome witneſſes (for that is alſo in the rule) this wants in his profeſſion, to your order of Cluniacenſis: but theſe prouiſions, were not neceſſarie or requiſite, for his admiſſion to the Ciſtertians, becauſe then hee was paſt his nonage, and was at his owne choyce and beſtowing. Why then (exclaymes the good Abbot) why then haue you robd me of my nephew? why haue you bereft mee of my ioy? Why haue yee taken away the fruite of my

my ſpirit, and the one halfe of my poor ſoule? might he not haue beene ſaued with me, if he had continued with me? O nephew ſaith hee, the vizard of holines hath beguiled thee, the pretence of religion hath ſeduced thee, the authority of the Ancients hath vndone thee. Now ſurely if the good Abbot inueigh ſo bitterly againſt theſe monkes, that thereupon he calls them rauening wolues, what might bee fit for me to do againſt theſe Ieſuits that haue robd me in my life time of my ſon, in ſuch an vnworthy faſhion? and when I challenge him, they deny him trecherouſly? peraduẽture they tooke ſome compaſſion of thee, as the monks did of young *Robert*. peraduenture thou hadſt beene in ſtate of damnation, if thou hadſt remained with thy Chriſtian Catholique parents, thy Vncles and Aunts, Brothers and Siſters. But if the bare changing of one monaſtery for another, was of ſuch feareful ſequele, that the poore ſoule was in danger of beeing damned for it (for ſo thinkes S. *Bernard*) what will betide thee, that treadeſt vnder thy feete and in ſuch a preſumptuous inſolent manner, ſpurneſt at, not God almightyes commaundements alone, but alſo the decrees and canons of our reuerend prelates and paſtors? & why forſooth? not to chaunge thy religion but thy habite, not the Church, but thy ranke and or-

der

der in the Church. Pray let me tell you what *Vigorius* once wrote in a ſermon of his, which he made of S. *Martin*, it is written to vs French men, you ſhall neuer find him vary in opinion from the auncient and moſt ſanctified Church gouernement: his words be theſe. S. *Martin* was a nouice in the Chriſtian religion, and not admitted into the congregation by the Sacrament of Baptiſme, and albeit hee dwelt with his parents which were gentiles, yet did he perform all good offices vnto them as became a Chriſtian: (for the Law of God doth not acquit that obligation, wherein a ſon is bound to his Father, or a ſeruant to his maſter. And ſurely the Church neuer taught *Martin* to be a rebell againſt his parents, but rather in all things to yeelde them due obedience and reſpect, ſo God were not offended.) Whereupon by reaſon of ſuch reuerent conformity vnto his parents commaund hee got this graunt from them, that conſidering for what vocation hee was moſt fit and addreſſed vnto that they would bee pleaſed to beſtow him in, for queſtionleſſe the ſonne is not left to any ſuch libertie, as either to marrie or betake himſelfe to anie ſort of liuing, without his Fathers approbation, I ſay vnto anie ſort of life, heeres no limitation [except he will be a monke]. And now that wee paſſe not ouer

Iuſti-

Iuſtinian the Emperor, grant him to bee of the opinion, that for a ſonne to vow a monaſtical life without his Fathers conſent, was neither a ſinne of ingratitude, nor any cauſe able in law to diſinherit him. Doth it therfore follow that becauſe it is no ſuch hainous offence as parricide or inceſt, therefore it is no offence? or it deſerues not diſinheriting, therefore muſt it paſſe without all correction, or if it be no ſinne is it therefore no fault? Why I tell you, a ſonne might not marrie without his fathers leaue, put caſe he had married, there was no law could extend ſo far as to diſinherit him, vnleſſe his wife were ſome leaud and infamous perſon: will your inference hereupon be, that therefore he offended not his father in marrying againſt his vvill, this is a notorious *non ſequitur*. And novv ſir, I tell you for your learning, let *Iuſtinian* ſpeake or thinke as pleaſeth him, all the Emperours before him made this caſe a matter of diſinheriting: aske you me what warrant I haue for it? marry ſir this, becauſe he profeſſeth in this one point, to correct the auncient Ciuill Law, and this I tell you withall, that take all thoſe Emperors together, eſpecially thoſe that were Chriſtian Emperours, and I truſt their ioint authorities ſhall ſway more, than *Iuſtinians* alone: who in all likelihood might haue as good leaue, to erre

erre therein, as he did miſtake in the matter of diuorce, & in participating with the hereſie of *Eutiches*? But certaine it is, that in the ende of that conſtitution, [*which is an act for bondmen comming to Chriſtianity,*] whereas *Iuſtinian* taketh away the penalty of diſinheriting, it is to bee vnderſtood of ſuch children of the Gentiles, as entring into holy orders, or monaſticall profeſſion, were therfore emancipated in caſe they were ſonnes, or *ipſo facto* enfranchiſed, if they were bond men. For had the act beene generall, comprizing all, or more ſpeciall, extending onelie to the children of Chriſtians, it is not to bee preſumed, but that hee would haue vſed ſome diſtinction, concerning their age, that thus betook themſelues either to holie orders, or monaſticall profeſſion; and haue ſaid, before fourteen yeares be compleat there's a nullity if a man profeſſe: after fourteene, there is none, the vow holds, and there is no danger of beeing diſinherited for the matter. So then *Iuſtinians* conſtitution (*in the titles of Biſhops and Clearg ymen*) is in this ſence to bee vnderſtood, that whereas the cauſe of our Chriſtian religion is to all intents much more fauourable, than Pagan Idolatry, therefore Pagans children, liued they vnder their parents verge and iuriſdiction, or liued they without it, both the one and the other might

vowe and professe religion, without paine or perill of being disinherited, (the forme whereof is described by *Theodoret* in his two and twentieth chapter:) and so might the bondmen of infidels be enfranchised, and in lieu of such manumissiō the church to yeeld no ransome backe againe vnto their former masters as it was enacted before *Iustinians* time, (the like prouision is made also by *Gregory* the first in his second booke, and 78. epistle, *if a Christian mayden would become a Conuert in anie house of religion, against her maisters leaue*) whereupon the close of the constitution followes in this maner, *and thus much hath our Imperiall maiesty beene pleased to ordaine and decree in contemplation of Gods cause and the enlargement of Christian Religion.* And if it bee lastly replyed, yea but *Iustinian* made the same Law euen for Christians also in 123. nouell constitution, and one of the last Paragraphs there: Probable it is, and in all likelihood to intended, that the case in most mens opinions would haue beene hardly thought of, for one to be disinherited because he was a monke, for in so being, hee still notwithstanding continued *Laye*, and entered not into holy orders, He succeeded his father by inheritance, his goods eschcated not to the Abbey, he kept himselfe still master of his owne, (as it is euident out of the

the 239. epiſtle of S. *Auſtin* to *Alipius* (and as I ſaid before) it reſted in their own free choice whether they would ſtil continue in their monaſterie, or forſake it. But when once vowes of pouertie and ſingle life, came to bee in requeſt, it had beene verie idle, for the parents to haue diſinherited them, that *ipſo facto* by their entrance into the monaſterie diſinherited themſelues, there was then no farther controuerſie to bee made of the matter, but whether the profeſſion would hold good againſt the Fathers conſent. Doth all this diſpleaſe you ſir, and ſticke you yet to cloſe to *Iuſtinian*? To encounter him, I oppoſe the ſixt generall Councell of Conſtantinople, I oppoſe that great Canon of the Church, in both which the heauie ſentence of excommunication which the Councell of Gangrene pronounceth againſt all ſuch kinde of offenders, is againe renewed & confirmed. But in a word to this forraigne Emperour, (whoſe lawes haue no authoritie to binde vs) I oppoſe the moſt excellent and flouriſhing Princes of our own natiue countrie, the decrees & conſtitutions of our French Church, the moſt commō and receiued opinions of al men, and the book cases as they were debated and determined in the court of Parliament. *Charles* the great, with the aduice and conſent of his Lords ſpi-

tuall and temporall enacted ſundrie lawes about Church matters (my Author for that which I deliuer is *Anſegiſtus*) amongſt the reſt, theſe be ſome in the fift booke, and 95. Chapter.

Now concerning boies and yong maidens it is flatlie forbidden that either the one ſhould be clipped, or the other veiled, without leaue of their parents. And whoſoeuer ſhall attempt ought againſt this act, ſhall be liable to that fine and amercement which is mentioned in ſome of the branches of our temporall lawes, and in deed the fine in that Salique law is vnder the title of them which either kill or clip *yong boies or maiden children*. Where it would be principallie noted, that in the intent of the law, it is abſolutelie all one, to kill our children and to match them to a monaſterie againſt their parents liking. For I pray tell me, is it not a kind of murder ſo to tirannize ouer them, that now they muſt become aliens to their owne parents, no kin to their kinsfolke? muſt die inteſtate, leaue no iſſue, keep no companie, muſt neuer ſee them ſo long as life laſteth, as though they were dead men, and out of mind? I euer before this thought that the Fabian law had onlie taken order with theſe purloining companions and man-ſtealers. But now I find that this great

Empe-

Emperor hath brought thē within compaſſe of the *Cornelian* law, and made them murderers. So then to ſumme vp all in a word, what manner of reproofe is this, what a ſtrange kind of challenge, that ſuch holie and bleſſed men forſooth our Sauiour Chriſt ſhould not onlie deem hypocrites, the Church accurſed miſcreants, the law manſtealers, *S. Bernard* wolues, but the Emperor ſhould brand them alſo for murderers? Looke to it in time Sirra, and looke to it, that ſuch and the like enormeous crimes doe not turne you and your mates one day out of this countrie and all the kings dominions, for ſome ſuch kind of ſpirituall murder, as hereafter you are verie like to haue a hand in. And now let vs take a ſhort view, of that which remaines whether there be any ſuch ſtatute at this time in force, as was that of *Charles* the great. *Charles* the ninth a Prince of famous memorie in a Parliament holden at *Orleance*, the 19. article, makes this order, that no parents, gardians, or kinſmen, man or woman, ſhould ſuffer either their children or their wards to enter into any monaſticall profeſſion, vnleſſe the one firſt, were going into fiue and twentie, the other into twentie. And if anie were profeſſed before ſuch times, the parties ſo profeſſed might neuertheleſſe haue power and intereſt to make and declare their

last wills and Testaments (euer with this prouiso) that they bequeathed nothing therein to their monasterie, anie former lawe or custome to the contrarie notwithstanding. This constitution is of larger extent, than the Councell of *Mentz* in their 16. and 20. question, the third and seuenth Chapters. For in case any man before such age should haue shaued his crowne, the intendment of the law is, that it was done in fraude and couin altogether, and to satisfie the monkes hungrie couetous humour. Furthermore it is so short of permitting children before that age, to enter into religion vvithout parents leaue and liking, that it expresly forbiddeth parents, gardians, or kinsmen, to giue any such leaue. Now if reports and book cases can doe any good with you, see here is the iudgement of a parliament assembled both of Lay and Ecclesiasticall persons as it was punctuallie giuen in thy verie case, by name (a case peraduenture, which the Iesuits of purpose haue concealed from thee) and it is this, *that whereas Petrus Ærodius Iustice of the Pleas of the Crowne hath put in a bill of complaint against hir yong Sonne Renate by the Iesuits fraudulentlie seduced and purloined from him, and whereas the Rector and President of Clerement Colledge haue beene cited and brought personallie into the*

Court

Court about the matter, it is therefore ordered and thought good by the Court at the motion of Faius the Kings Atturney general, that Æredius shall haue a commission granted vnto him to enquire and make search after his stolne sonne, (for had they not stood vpon the negatiue in pleading not guilty, the decree would haue been that they must haue laine fast by it till they had rendred thee openlie in Court) *in the meane while the Court doth straightlie forbid that ought be done to the preiudice of this their order, and that the Iesuits entertaine him not into their societie as they will answer to the contrarie, and that no excuse of ignorance may be herein pretended by the brethren of that company, they charge and require withall that they of Clermont Colledge certifie so much vnto their seuerall companies whereabout. Giuen at the Parliament the 20. of May.* 1586. Happily you shall also in time reade, what the states of *France* assembled at Blois haue humblie besought his maiestie now our king, *Henry* the third in this verie businesse, and what he will conclude thereupon after his brother the king deceased. I am sure in the *Interim* his pleasure was *that the Pope should bee certified thus much, that whereas all good men were much offended herewith, his holinesse would set to his helping hand, that it might be reformed and redressed.* Now sir what

what can you answere to all these reasons? all these lawes and precedents? If for this offence of thine, or rather thy seducers offence (to whome indeede it is more proper) I haue bin grieued, am I grieued (think'st thou) without cause? or is it naturall affection, flesh & bloud that makes me beyond measure passionate? or is it my grosse ignorãce that knowes not in the matter of religion what appertaines to pietie, honestly, or any duty else of great importance. I trust you are informed and throughly resolued by this time, that bee the religious life good and commendable in it selfe, or newter and indifferent, it ill beseemed you, (sonne) in making choyce of either so contemptuously to haue neglected me. For were it indifferent theres a necessitie would haue forced you to obedience, but had it bene good and commendable, it would neuer haue proued the worse for my approbation. Indeede if none could be found now a daies, that would offer their children to the Churches seruice, and if it were absolutelie necessarie that young men should minister in the Church, in Gods name then let religion bee priuiledged to robbe and steale our children from vs (as thou wast from me) it skills not much by force or policie: but whereas there is such a number of Churches and Abbeyes, can any man say, that there is

not

not plenty enough to ſupply ſuch places but if (and ſpeake what may bee ſpoken for the contrarie) the vow which children make, bee good & iuſtifiable, without the parents leaue, yet, me ſeemes ſomewhat ſhould bee left vnto their diſpoſition, wherein they ſhould beare ſome ſtroake, as peraduenture; to make choice of one Abbey before an other, for their children to be profeſt in; and if there be no remedy but that parents muſt be ſo ſlightly put by, when the queſtion ſtands betwixt them and religion, yet me thinkes twere well, that ſome few reliques ſhould ſtill remaine of that ancient dutie & reuerence, which God & nature preſcribed for parents. But the caſe is farre otherwiſe now, for it comes ſo ſhort to the buſineſſe in hand, that parents in any lawe, ſhould bee relinquiſht and deſtituted of their children, that euen they which haue written in an high ſtile for commendation of the ſolitarie life (as moſt monkes haue done) confeſſe that children may bee diſmiſſed out of their cloyſter, and diſclaime their vow, to bee attendant on their parents. And that this vow is of a greater obligation, and much more ancient for continuance, then any other vow whatſoeuer, it may be prooued out of S. *Gregory Nazianzene*, for he being ſent for to come home from his monaſtery by his Father, be-

cauſe

cause he was now growne olde, and not able to follow suites in law, which came thicke vpon him by reason of a publique charge wherein hee bare office, and hauing lost also his other sonne *Cesarius*, forsooke his Couent, made speed to returne to his Father *Gregorie*, and his mother *Nonna*, which then to their farther griefe, had buried their daughter *Gorgonia*: the same appeares in like manner out of *Heliodor* of whom wee spake before, who left to be an Eremite, and left *S. Hieromes* company, to assist and helpe, not his Father, but his sister and nephew. *S. Austin* holds the same opinion or whosoeuer be the Authour *ad fratres in Eremo*; and will haue no man enforced to returne backe againe to his monastery, except his Father bee dead first. *S. Herome* in an Epistle to *Fabiola*, speakes of this kinde of desertion, where hee saith, how many monkes haue beene cause of destroying their owne soules, in compassionating the estate of their Fathers and Mothers? in which wordes hee doth not simply condemne such desertion, so it be without frawde, to do true seruice to their parents, but his meaning is, that many monks pretending such manner of excuses, doe thereby hazard the vtter vndoing of their owne soules. Wherefore put case I had beene content and willing to haue made thee a Iesuite,

couldst

couldſt thou yet find in thy heart, now at this time eſpeciallie, to leaue mee, and liue apart from me? couldeſt thou holde it for a religious courſe, to lurke in a Cell, (nay a Gayle for that is *Baccharius* word for a monaſterie) where thou mighteſt ſleepe in a whole skinne at pleaſure, and vnderſtand of our ciuil broils or rather lawleſſe open robberies, that ruine and lay waſt thy flouriſhing natiue countrye? nay couldeſt thou forbeare, to repayre home with al ſpeed poſſible, to be helpfull, attendant and ſeruiceable vnto vs, to allay and mittigate the ſurpaſſing ſorrow, whereof euerie good mans hart is ſenſible in this our countries combuſtion? But perhaps they detaine thee by violence; Well, bee it ſo, for I am more prone to think ſo, then to imagine thou art cleane paſt all ſence of humanitie, al good nature & gentry, chieflie at this time & ſeaſon, when Princes ioyn iſſue in armes, not for matter of religion, but for a ſoueraign monarchy? but laying aſide all prerogatiue of antiquity in our preſent queſtion, (if you be ſo pleaſed) let vs argue the matter by reaſō a while: wheras it is ſo that you accōpt marriage for a Sacramēt and for precedence in time, the firſt that euer was ordained in this world, how happens it, that you giue it no better entertainment amongſt you? doth it not neceſſarilie follow,

that

that Church and common-wealth both must partake euident losse, when either it is so prophanelie polluted, or not set by? when it is bereft of the fruit of mariage, which are children, robd of those sweet loue pledges? when you vntie that knot, which is knit faster, than any knot that fire and water, bed and boord, or plighting of troth, did euer tie? Why, who will take any paines to bring vp his children, if after all his care taken, and costs bestowed, when all is done, they must be another mans children, and not the fathers? If by direct authoritie or indeed rather by a kind of Mahometicall immanitie, they be hald and lugd away from their parents? if as soone as our wiues be brought to bed, and deliuered, the shaueling that first can seize vpon our child must haue him for his paines? he that robs a father of his child, a foster father of his foster sonne, or a master of his man, in the opinion of *Tertullian* writing against *Marcion*, commits an act of impietie against God, sins against the parent, wrongs the foster father, and trespasses against the master. To take away filiall obedience, and dutie to parents, is to grub vp nature by the root, to windshake all that commerce and societie, which is between man & man, euen from the very groũd plot, and foundation. Obedience saith *S. Cy-*

prian

prian in his booke of the abuſes of the world, is the mother of all gouernment, then farewell all gouernment when parents cannot be obeied. And becauſe paritie in honour and eſtate breeds quarrells and contention, therefore hath God made many formes of gouernment, many of ſubiection. As husband and wife, father and ſonne, old and yong, bond and free, Prince and ſubiect, maſter and ſcholler, as S. *Chryſoſtome* ſpeaks in his Epiſtle to the Romanes, take away theſe ſubordinations, and there is no companie or ſocietie of men can poſſiblie continue. Nay the concluſion cannot be gainſaid, doe but once proue diſobedient to parents, and preſentlie you fall downe headlong into Atheiſme, or hereſie, as it is deliuered with common conſent, by all ſorts of men, as well Chriſtians as heathen; and by name, by *Plutarch* in his booke *de fraterna amicitia*, and by the author of a late diſcourſe. But it were better to hear the Authors in their owne words. There is no man ſaith *Plutarch*, who though he thinke otherwiſe in his conſcience, would not affirme and in words maintaine that the Gods ought to bee worſhipped in the firſt place, our parents next to them, and that in ſo large an extent, that nothing can be ſo acceptable to the Gods as when they ſee children repaying ſome v-

ſurie

ſurie for their parents bounty, whereas they be not able to pay the principal. Contrariwiſe that there is no argument ſo pregnant, to conuince them of Atheiſme, as by deſpiſing their parents, and treſpaſſing neuer ſo ſleightly againſt them. The other vtters himſelfe thus; What makes yong men now a daies ſo ſoone turne ſchiſmatiques? why ſaith he, they do not honor their parents, as they ought to do, as if he ſhould haue ſaid, it is no great wonder if they forſake the faith and religion of their forefathers, when they once take a taſte of contempt and diſobedience againſt their naturall parents. Good God, if ſuch diſloyall behauiour might either be endured or commended, what? ought this to be a time for ſuch tolleration? to be a place? where there is ſcarce to be found any one, who by ſome meanes or other claimes not an immunity, from doing his duty to God, or the king, or the Magiſtrate, or laſtly to his Elders? why but all theſe preheminences are to be found in a father, all theſe relations of duty in a ſon. Is it then honeſt and conuenient for mee, to ſhew any countenance to him that beſides his graceleſſe neglect of mee, is ſo vngratefull and irreuerent? In the latter daies (as S. *Paul* writeth to *Timothie*) *there ſhall come perilous times, men ſhall be louers of themſelues,*

blaſphemers

blaſphemers, diſobedient to fathers and mothers vngratefull, without naturall affection. Shouldſt thou now replie and ſay, why but good father, after I am once profeſt into religion, I will honor you a great deale the more, I will eſteem of you much more highly than before? I tell thee againe, duty can neuer ſpring from diſobedience. Beſides all this, I would faine know what colour can be giuen, why thoſe grand ſchoole men, as *Scotus*, *Durandus*, *Aquinas*, *Paludanus*, *Dominicus Soto*, and many mo, ſhould enter into ſuch ſerious and deepe diſputes, whether the children of infidells might lawfullie be baptized againſt their parents will. *Thomas* abſolutelie holds that they may not, and ſaies that the Church neuer permitted ſuch a baptiſm, (not Pope *Siluester* to *Conſtantine* the great, nor *S. Ambroſe* to *Theodoſius*) And yet to make no queſtion of maintaining this doctrine, that our children may bind themſelues by a religious vow, though the father neuer ſo much proteſt againſt it. Doubtleſſe if the parents be chriſtians, the generall tenent is, that they may be forceably compelled, to initiate their children in the ſame religion: but if it be but a particular rule or couent of Regulars, then they hold they may not, for that is left to their owne diſcretions. As for example, they ſay, that to be

bapti-

baptized in the faith of Christ it is sufficient for any: but to be of Dominickes or S. *Austins* order, it is not necessary. But were a man Iew or Gentile, Saint *Thomas* peremptorily denies, that either in case he bee of full age, hee should be violently constrained, or being vnder yeares, his parents should bee forced to yeeld their consent to his baptisme. And the Toletane Councell, whereof you shall finde Recorde in *Gratians* decrees, at the fiue and fortith distinction, in the chapter of the Iews. And *Gregory* the greate, writing to *Virgilius* and *Theodorus*, Bishoppes of Fraunce, in his fiue and fortieth Epistle; If you list (saith he) you may speake him fairelye, and aske him whether hee likes better, to liue in a cloyster, then in the worlde at large. But I pray you tell mee, is it force or fayre dealing when such a promise as this hath beene extorted from him (*as to say I will be a monke*) afterwards to keep him a close prisoner, or to lead and driue him vp and downe, to the intent he shall neuer light vpon his father or any one of his kinne, which might perchance diuert him from that resolution, which was put vpon him before hee came to yeares, or in the prime of his youth when (as *Cicero* saith) counsell and discretion is at the weakest? What sir, are you become an other *Hercules Prodicus*, that must forsooth

forſooth by and by be wiſe, as ſoone as youare eighteene? what, is there no other courſe to be held, for the furniſhing of Churches and monaſteries, but that children doe preſently abiure their parents ſight and company, as if they were baniſhed perſons? the Church of God neuer allowed of this courſe, but in the childrē of the Iews, which was to this end, that hauing bene once voluntarily Chriſtned, they might not afterwards relapſe into their parents errors. And ſo it is in the Canon. But for one Chriſtian brother to ſuſpect or diſtruſt an other, in ſuch a caſe as this, of infidelity or Iudaiſme, what manner of ſtrange Goſpell were this? how can any man make this good, that whereas by the diſcipline of the Church, Prieſts may not bleſſe the married couple, if they be not giuen by their parents, a Biſhop of one Dioceſe may not giue orders to one of another Dioceſe, without the leaue of his Dioceſan: A Clarke that is a forrayner may not bee entertained to ſerue any where, without letters *dimiſſoryes*, or a certificat from him that made him: but our ſonnes and our daughters may make vowes, which ſhal be admited & accepted of, though there be no giuing no cōmending of them, no aprouing of them? yet the vovv muſt ſtil be obſerued. And now at length to conclude all this diſcourſe, whatſo-

euer hath beene hitherto alleadged against thee, reckon thou of it at thy pleasure, make as light account of my fatherly authority as thou wilt, or rather as they please to command thee to make. with whom thou liuest in so blessed and deifying an estate, yet such as be well borne, not of base kinde, will bee of a different opinion from thee, and thinke it built vppon foure maine columnes. The principal piller which beares vp the fabrique, is the indignation of the liuing God, that esteemes a wrong done to parents as done to himselfe. How ill is the report of him that forsaketh his Father (saith the Preacher,) and accursed of God that is bitter to his mother? The second is the iudgement of banishment, which the Father pronounceth against him for his vndutifulnesse. Depart from me, come no more in my sight: for albeit, (as it should appeare) thou hast but a very meane conceipt of it, yet very certaine it is, that Gods seuerity is then greatest, when a Father wil not vouchsafe to see his childe, a Prince not deigne to looke vpon his subiect, nor admit them vnto their presence, which ought to be most gladsom & cheerfull to them. I said Gods seueritie was then greatest, for is it not so that euerlasting damnation of body and soule consisteth only in the depriuatiō of Gods blessed vision;

and

and Gods bleſſed viſion is al the wages and reward that man, can expect for from God? And men vſe to be moſt ſeuere likewiſe in this kind. For *Dauid* puniſhed *Abſalon* ſo. Wherupon, after two yeeres ſpace continued in this diſgrace, oh (ſaith hee) if my Father bee yet mindfull of mine iniquity, good *Ioab*, be thou a ſuiter for mee rather that hee will kill mee? And did not *Manlius Torquatus* proceed in the ſelfe ſamemanner againſt *Iunius Syllanus* of whome the Macedonians complained of for briberie and extortion. Becauſe thou haſt not (ſaith hee) demeaned thy ſelfe ſo in thy office, as thy woorthy Anceſtors haue done before thee, therfore I forbid thee from henceforth euer to approach vnto my preſence; ſurely hee was not able to endure the ſentence, he ſlew himſelfe. The like is reported of *Marcus Scaurus*, that when his ſon returned diſhonourably out of the field, ſent him this meſſage, ſince I heare you are turned baſe coward, let me neuer ſee you more. The meſſage deliuered, he fel vpon his ſword with more valour and reſolution than euer before he had vſed againſt the enemy. And *Auguſtus Ceſar*, when one *Tarrius* his ſon was conuented before him for the like offence, gaue this iudgement, that hee was puniſhed with a witnes, whom the Father would not endure once

to looke vpon. *Plato* yeelds an excellent reaſon, if there bee no ſhrines in the Temple ſo beautifull in the eie of the children to looke on as the portraiture of the Gods, no treaſure ſo pretious at home, as their aged and impotent parents, what worſe puniſhment can you deuiſe againſt them, than ſo to doom them, as to depriue them of their preſence, that be the patrõ gods of their family, & neuer to be ſuffered, to touch or to kiſſe them more. If baniſhment ſeeme only in this reſpect, a puniſhment intollerable, becauſe it depriues vs of beholding certaine faire buildings, and tomb ſtones, which we term monuments, what then may we thinke of ſuch a puniſhment as wherby we ſhall be bard, of their ſweet companie that erected ſuch ſumptuous buildings for vs, nay erected vs? that would poſſeſſe no more then what they might leaue after their death to vs their children. Now concerning the King, *Auguſtus Cæſars* example is at hand to proue it, who vppon a reuenge to puniſh the Athenians choſe rather to ariue at the Iland *Ægina* which was much out of his way, than (as he thought) to do them ſo much honor as to be ſeen at *Athens*. The like example haue we in *Marcus Antonius* the Philoſopher that trauailing by

Antio-

Antiochia would not be entreated to come into the City, becauſe they took part with *Anidius*. Freſh alſo is the example of *Charles* the eight our French king, who comming with his army back from the expedition of *Naples*, and rendring his deuout thanks to God at S. *Denis* for the victory, would not ſo much as endure to come at *Paris*, becauſe they aided him not in his iourny for the wars. The third ſort of animaduerſion which parēts, euer had, and euer ſhall haue, (as ſaith *S. Ambroſe* in that one book of his which he entitles *de benedictionibus patriarcharum*,) is that bleſſing which they giue to their kind and dutifull children, and that curſe which they denounce againſt vnnaturall and diſobedient ones. The fathers bleſſing (as *Elias* the Cretiā ſpeaketh) is the wages of obedience, and therefore S. *Gregory* that had bin dutifull to his father, deſires not that he would giue him his bleſſing, but that he would pay it him for his ſeruice. But be it that thou value it not at any ſuch high rate as *Iacob*, or *Ioſeph*, or *Nazianzene*, yet I would wiſh thee ſtand in feare of the curſe. Remember *Noahs* ſonnes, think on that which is written in *Deuteronomy* and is ſecond in order of the Comminations: *Curſed is he that honoureth not his father and mother and*

all the people shall say Amen. Meditate of that which is written in the third of *Ecclesiasticus*, the blessing of the father establisheth the houses of their children, but the curse of the mother roots vp the foundatiõs: all which you shall find in *Antiochus* who was himselfe a Monk, in his 108. Homilie. Look vpon that in *Homer* his 2. Odissea, where *Telemachus* stands fearefull to cast his mother out of doores, because of her curse. Call to thy remembrance that which is written by *Plato*, in the eleuenth book of his Lawes, how that all those imprecations of *Oedipus*, *Amynter*, and *Theseus* vttered against their children, were entertained and ratified in heauen, oh there is nothing in the word saith he so pernicious to a child, as the curse of his father! Lastly bethinke thou of that which is in *Suidas* of *Leõtius* a Bishop of *Tripoly*, whose praier God almighty heard, and that was, that his sonne might rather die, than that he should see him liue a graceless & dissolute life. The last remedy that parents may vse in this case, is the helpe of the Iudge who vpon complaint made, seuerely censures or imprisons the offenders, and giues such iudgement against them, as the parents do require. For so *Alexander* the Emperour answered one that made the

the like petition. All hard measure, and rigor would be vsed towards a saucie and malepart sonne, though should a stranger so offend, the offence I grant were not so hainous. And what is the reason? mary sir, that children might not so much as conceiue, that there was any thing in the world more sacred or inuiolable than their parents. It is storied in the French Chronicles in the raigne of King *Lewis*, that *Stenen Boley* Prouost of *Paris*, caused one to be hangd, for no other reason, but that his mother had complained of him, that do what she could do, he would neuer leaue filching and stealing. To conclude then, that may be spoken to you which *Ierom* hath in his book *de honorãdis parentibus*, you that wil be fathers hereafter, you must honor your fathers, and loue your mothers with a tender affection, that your wiues after you be married may deserue to be mothers also. It remains therfore that if you haue a purpose to free thy selfe from these punishments, which as thou seest all lawes do inflict vpon a disobedient son, and if this discourse of mine, worke so well with thee that thou come to thy selfe again, if there be any goodnesse in thee, bethinke thee of thy dutie in Gods name, presentlie and out of hand thus doe,

doe, fulfill Christs parable in me, let vs make good cheare my friends and be merrie, for this my son was dead and is aliue, lost and now is found. The Church hath her armes alwaies open, to embrace the penitent soule (it is true) yet this mercifull disposition they first learned from parents. Before thou canst crie, I will heare thee, come then and we will bee friends, returne vnto me and all shall be well: and now will I vse the like words to thee as *S. Bernard* did to his nephew: Against all due proceeding of law, I, that haue been wronged, doe yet withdrawne mine action, I haue bin offended and despised, yet sue I vnto the scorner, I haue been iniuriously dealt withall, yet I offer amēds vnto him that did me the wrong, and in few words, I seek vnto him that first should haue besought me. Or to vse the speech of *Cæsarius*, in his 30. homilie, he that is the iudge entreates to pardon the prisoner: but if they buz into thy head that when thou shalt once be fiue and twenty yeers old, then maist thou be at thy owne disposition, and after that age who can challenge thee for thy disobedience. I tell thee sonne, and te thee againe, though naturall duty, can neither be dayde nor yeard, nor determined by age, or eldership, nay the more yeers the more

duty,

duty, (whereupon *Plato* vſed more ſeueritie to one of thirty, then to one vnder fiue and twenty, for being vndutifull to his father, (I tell thee I ſay, hadſt thou been with me, and ſo continued to the terme of lawfull age, by that time, in likelihood I might haue yeelded ſomwhat vnto thee, eſpecially if I had ſeen a ſuitable diſpoſition in thee for that kind of life, whereunto thou waſt addicted. But now the caſe is far otherwiſe, for as a woman child vnder the age of twelue being forced and abuſed, by any man, and ſhe after the rape committed abide with the rauiſher, can not be ſaid all that while to be of yeers, and theres anullity in the mariage, if any ſuch be contracted between them, as it hath been decreed in the Councel of *Trent*: ſo what age ſoeuer thou comeſt to in that place, where thou art kept priſoner much againſt my will, think not that any ſuch aduantage acrues thereby, but may be void, and fruſtrate, to the intent either of law or religion, notwithſtanding all your preſcription. Would you haue a reaſon? why ſir, becauſe the Ieſuits ſeduced thee, and ſtill deteine thee, with an euill conſcience, and a ſcãdalous example. The excuſe wil not ſerue to ſay, the action was the holy ghoſts, for ſurely the holie Ghoſt hath no hand in a ſinful

FINIS.